

NON-BINDING ARBITRATION BEFORE
JEFFREY C. FEREDAY, ARBITRATOR

Initiated Pursuant to Final Settlement Stipulation
Kansas v. Nebraska & Colorado
No. 126, Orig., U.S. Supreme Court
Decree of May 29, 2003, 538 U.S. 720

N-CORPE Augmentation Plan
(Arbitration Initiated July 10, 2013)

DEPOSITION OF DICK WOLFE, P.E.

Wednesday, January 15, 2014

9:05 a.m.

PURSUANT TO NOTICE and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the above-entitled deposition was taken on behalf of the State of Kansas at 1313 Sherman Street, Suite 821, Denver, Colorado, before Denise A. Freeman, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public within Colorado.

1 APPEARANCES:
 2 For the State of Colorado:
 3 SCOTT STEINBRECHER, ESQ.
 4 Colorado Department of Law
 5 Natural Resources and Environment
 6 Federal and Interstate Water Unit
 7 Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
 8 1300 Broadway, 7th Floor
 9 Denver, Colorado 80203
 10
 11 By Telephone for the State of Kansas:
 12 CHRISTOPHER M. GRUNEWALD, ESQ.
 13 Kansas Attorney General's Office
 14 Memorial Hall, 2nd Floor
 15 120 SW 10th Avenue
 16 Topeka, Kansas 66612-1597
 17 By Telephone for the State of Nebraska:
 18 JUSTIN D. LAVENE, ESQ.
 19 BLAKE JOHNSON, ESQ.
 20 Nebraska Attorney General's Office
 21 P.O. Box 98920
 22 Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-8920
 23 2155 State Capitol
 24 Lincoln, Nebraska 68509
 25
 THOMAS R. WILMOTH, ESQ.
 Special Assistant Attorneys General
 Blankenau, Wilmoth, Jarecke, LLP
 206 South 13th Street, Suite 1425
 Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-2002
 Also Present:
 Dr. Willem Schreüder
 Daniel Steuer
 Dale Book

1 PROCEEDINGS
 2 DICK WOLFE, P.E.,
 3 having been first duly sworn, was examined and
 4 testified as follows:
 5 EXAMINATION
 6 BY MR. GRUNEWALD:
 7 Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolfe.
 8 A. Good morning.
 9 Q. And I'll just note for the record that you
 10 are here with a notice of telephonic deposition, and
 11 this is the deposition primarily regarding your joint
 12 expert report with Dr. Willem Schreüder. Have you seen
 13 that notice?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. Now you have been deposed before; is that
 16 right?
 17 A. Correct.
 18 Q. And you are familiar with the process; is
 19 that right?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. What we are going to do is -- by phone, it's
 22 a little trickier -- but we will try to make a clear
 23 record here with complete answers, and I will do my best
 24 to not talk over you.
 25 If you think of something later that you

1 INDEX
 2 EXAMINATION PAGE
 3 January 15, 2014
 4 By Mr. Grunewald 4
 5 EXHIBITS INITIAL REFERENCE
 6 1 Notice of Telephonic Deposition of 5
 7 Dick Wolfe, P.E.
 8 2 Letter to David Barfield, P.E., and 14
 9 Dick Wolfe, P.E., from Brian P.
 10 Dunnigan, P.E., dated June 10, 2013
 11 3 Joint Expert Report; Dick Wolfe, 8
 12 P.E., State Engineer, and Dr. Willem
 13 Schreüder, Principia Mathematica
 14 (Exhibits attached to original and electronic
 15 transcripts to counsel ordering same.)
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 want to add, please let me know and we'll make sure you
 2 give a complete answer. Or if you don't understand my
 3 questions, please let me know. Does that sound okay?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. And if you need to take a break, just let me
 6 know.
 7 A. Okay. Thank you.
 8 Q. Is there any reason this morning, such as
 9 medication or any other reason, you think your answers
 10 will not be truthful and complete?
 11 A. No.
 12 (Deposition Exhibit 1 was marked.)
 13 Q. (BY MR. GRUNEWALD) Great. The deposition
 14 notice, which is Exhibit 1 here for your deposition,
 15 refers to your joint expert report, and the notice
 16 requests that you bring any backup materials, either
 17 electronic or hard copy, that haven't previously been
 18 provided. Is there any such material that needs to be
 19 provided to the states?
 20 A. No.
 21 Q. Regarding the joint expert report, who was
 22 it that drafted the text of your joint expert report?
 23 A. I would say, it was a joint effort between
 24 myself and Dr. Schreüder.
 25 Q. Were there any portions that were just your

<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>1 portions of the text?</p> <p>2 A. I don't remember exactly. I remember, in</p> <p>3 the process, we worked together on this and were</p> <p>4 exchanging drafts going back and forth and were making</p> <p>5 modifications to those drafts.</p> <p>6 So I believe that the final version you see</p> <p>7 before you is truly a joint effort. I don't think I</p> <p>8 could parse out a specific paragraph or sections in</p> <p>9 there that were specifically myself or Dr. Schreüder.</p> <p>10 Q. Is there any portion of the text of the</p> <p>11 report that was not drafted by either you or</p> <p>12 Dr. Schreüder?</p> <p>13 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>14 Q. And did anyone else besides Dr. Schreüder</p> <p>15 assist you in completing the report?</p> <p>16 A. I don't think there was anybody else who</p> <p>17 assisted in completing it. I know that our counsel did</p> <p>18 review the report before it was submitted.</p> <p>19 Q. So there were no other staff at the Colorado</p> <p>20 Division of Water Resources that worked on the report?</p> <p>21 A. I don't believe so.</p> <p>22 Q. And do you know if anyone else besides</p> <p>23 Dr. Schreüder, with Principia Mathematica, his company,</p> <p>24 or other consultants -- do you know if any of those</p> <p>25 others worked on the report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>1 would have to defer to Dr. Schreüder if he had done any</p> <p>2 specific analysis beyond the review of the materials</p> <p>3 that Nebraska had provided as part of their report.</p> <p>4 Q. So Dr. Schreüder did not discuss with you</p> <p>5 any accounting results regarding Colorado's accounting</p> <p>6 results regarding operation of this project?</p> <p>7 A. Well, we did discuss the project and the</p> <p>8 materials submitted and the accounting that was provided</p> <p>9 by Nebraska and the results therefrom, but the way I</p> <p>10 understood your question is whether we performed an</p> <p>11 independent analysis of that and did our own accounting,</p> <p>12 if you will. And that's what I was referring to in my</p> <p>13 previous response.</p> <p>14 Q. Great. Thank you. And you understood my</p> <p>15 question correctly.</p> <p>16 The accounting results from Nebraska that</p> <p>17 you were referring to, do you remember what those</p> <p>18 accounting results showed regarding Colorado's Compact</p> <p>19 accounting results?</p> <p>20 A. In my discussion with Dr. Schreüder, I guess</p> <p>21 the result of all of that is, there was not an impact to</p> <p>22 Colorado regarding the operation of the N-CORPE project.</p> <p>23 (Deposition Exhibit 3 was marked.)</p> <p>24 Q. (BY MR. GRUNEWALD) Thank you. The joint</p> <p>25 report that is Exhibit 3 here for your deposition, does</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>1 A. I did not have any contact with other</p> <p>2 individuals other than Dr. Schreüder. He would have to</p> <p>3 respond whether there were other staff members in his</p> <p>4 office that assisted him in that effort.</p> <p>5 Q. Thank you. Did you or anyone else for</p> <p>6 Colorado perform any analysis of the impact that</p> <p>7 operating the N-CORPE project -- let me back up. For</p> <p>8 the reporter's sake, I'll go over acronyms, which I</p> <p>9 should have done at the beginning.</p> <p>10 I referred to N-CORPE, and so the second</p> <p>11 exhibit gives you the spelling out of the acronym, and</p> <p>12 what we are going over here is a proposal by Nebraska.</p> <p>13 And the acronym stands for the following: Nebraska</p> <p>14 Cooperative Republican Platte Enhancement.</p> <p>15 And some other acronyms we might be</p> <p>16 referring to this morning are FSS, which is Final</p> <p>17 Settlement Stipulation. And also RRCA, which is</p> <p>18 Republican River Compact Administration.</p> <p>19 And please interject, Mr. Wolfe or the court</p> <p>20 reporter, if you want us to explain more.</p> <p>21 So, Mr. Wolfe, did you or anyone for</p> <p>22 Colorado perform any analysis of the impact of operating</p> <p>23 the N-CORPE project on the Compact accounting results</p> <p>24 for Colorado?</p> <p>25 A. I did not perform such an analysis, but I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>1 that joint expert report contain all of your opinions</p> <p>2 about the proposal?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. I am going to ask you a couple of questions</p> <p>5 about the proposal. I don't think you will need it</p> <p>6 handy, but you can certainly get it in front of you, if</p> <p>7 you would like. Does the N-CORPE proposal contain a</p> <p>8 maximum limit to the annual pumping?</p> <p>9 A. What I believe to be the maximum limit</p> <p>10 associated with this project is the 60,000 acre-feet</p> <p>11 that's described in the proposal.</p> <p>12 Q. Is that 68,000 acre-feet of pumping?</p> <p>13 A. Yes. And just to be clear, 60,000. I</p> <p>14 didn't know if you said 68- or 60-, but 60,000 acre-feet</p> <p>15 of pumping, is my response.</p> <p>16 Q. Thank you. Does the proposal contain a</p> <p>17 maximum limit on the amount of credit that Nebraska can</p> <p>18 receive under the plan?</p> <p>19 A. Again, I think, depending on the operations,</p> <p>20 based on their simulated runs, it appears that the</p> <p>21 possible maximum credit could be 60,000 acre-feet in a</p> <p>22 given year.</p> <p>23 Q. Thank you. The N-CORPE proposal has a</p> <p>24 pipeline discharging into Medicine Creek in Nebraska.</p> <p>25 Does that sound right?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you familiar with the Medicine Creek</p> <p>3 reach in Nebraska?</p> <p>4 A. When you say, "familiar," could you be more</p> <p>5 specific?</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know where it is?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I know where it's geographically</p> <p>8 located.</p> <p>9 Q. I am going to ask you some questions about</p> <p>10 Medicine Creek, so just let me know if you don't</p> <p>11 understand my questions.</p> <p>12 A. Sure.</p> <p>13 Q. Are there surface water gauges that are on</p> <p>14 Medicine Creek, to your knowledge?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you know what gauges there are?</p> <p>17 A. I guess the one that comes to mind is,</p> <p>18 there's a gauge that is located upstream of the</p> <p>19 reservoir.</p> <p>20 Q. Which reservoir is that?</p> <p>21 A. Harry Strunk.</p> <p>22 Q. Is Harry Strunk Reservoir on Medicine Creek?</p> <p>23 A. That's my understanding, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Are there any other gauges besides the gauge</p> <p>25 upstream of the reservoir?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 than 10. But, again, I don't remember the exact</p> <p>2 distance, but I certainly don't recall it being in the</p> <p>3 order of, like, a hundred miles.</p> <p>4 Q. Will there be any transit losses of the</p> <p>5 water discharged from the augmentation pipeline as it</p> <p>6 goes from the discharge point to Harry Strunk Reservoir?</p> <p>7 A. My general understanding of that, based on</p> <p>8 my discussions with Dr. Schreüder and my recollection of</p> <p>9 the discussion that took place at the workshop on</p> <p>10 June 27 and at the actual special meeting on July 9, is</p> <p>11 that that's generally a gaining reach.</p> <p>12 Q. Does that mean there will be no transit</p> <p>13 losses of the water discharged from the augmentation</p> <p>14 pipeline?</p> <p>15 A. Could you help me -- when you are describing</p> <p>16 transit losses, are you talking about them physically or</p> <p>17 what the net result of flow is in that reach? I just</p> <p>18 want to be clear in your question. I apologize.</p> <p>19 Q. Please don't apologize. I am sure it has to</p> <p>20 do with my question, if anything, but let's certainly</p> <p>21 try and make things clear.</p> <p>22 Physically is the water that's discharged</p> <p>23 from the augmentation pipeline, is that physical</p> <p>24 quantity of water going to reach Harry Strunk Reservoir</p> <p>25 in total or is anything less than that physical amount</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 A. I don't recall any. I am just recalling the</p> <p>2 one immediately above the reservoir, but I am not</p> <p>3 absolutely certain if there are other gauges on Medicine</p> <p>4 Creek either above or below the reservoir.</p> <p>5 Q. Does the Compact accounting take in any data</p> <p>6 from any of the gauges on Medicine Creek?</p> <p>7 A. It's my understanding that the gauge above</p> <p>8 Harry Strunk is one of those gauges.</p> <p>9 Q. It's your understanding that the gauge above</p> <p>10 Harry Strunk Reservoir is used for the Compact</p> <p>11 accounting?</p> <p>12 A. That's my understanding, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know how many stream miles there are</p> <p>14 between the discharge point of the pipeline for the</p> <p>15 project and Harry Strunk Reservoir?</p> <p>16 A. I know that number's been presented before.</p> <p>17 I am just not recalling the exact distance here today.</p> <p>18 I know it's a distance between them, but I don't</p> <p>19 remember the exact stream mileage.</p> <p>20 Q. Could you estimate it? Is it more like</p> <p>21 10 miles or more like a hundred miles?</p> <p>22 A. No. I think it's in the order of a few</p> <p>23 miles versus a hundred miles.</p> <p>24 Q. So less than 10?</p> <p>25 A. My recollection -- as I recall, it was less</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 going to reach Harry Strunk Reservoir?</p> <p>2 A. I guess I can't answer that absolutely</p> <p>3 because that -- I did not look at any specific</p> <p>4 calculations or analyses in regards to any specific</p> <p>5 transit loss.</p> <p>6 My understanding of that is just based on</p> <p>7 discussions with, again, Dr. Schreüder and what he has</p> <p>8 described to me, the characteristics of that stream, and</p> <p>9 has indicated to me that it's generally a gaining reach</p> <p>10 in there.</p> <p>11 And I recollect that that was maybe about</p> <p>12 the extent of my discussion with him on that. So he</p> <p>13 would maybe be one to further explore whether any</p> <p>14 specific analysis was done on the actual transit loss</p> <p>15 determination.</p> <p>16 Q. I believe you said you didn't look at any</p> <p>17 specific analyses, so I wanted to make sure I</p> <p>18 understood. So you haven't seen any specific analyses</p> <p>19 of the reach on Medicine Creek between the discharge</p> <p>20 point of the pipeline and Harry Strunk Reservoir? Is</p> <p>21 that what you are saying?</p> <p>22 A. I don't recall looking at a specific, say,</p> <p>23 report or analysis. I am vaguely remembering that this</p> <p>24 was part of the discussion that took place at the</p> <p>25 workshop. And as I recollect, I think Kansas was asking</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 some questions of Nebraska about the transit loss and</p> <p>2 they were describing their understanding of the transit</p> <p>3 loss that you refer to there.</p> <p>4 And I don't recall if there were specific</p> <p>5 reports or analyses they have done that they had</p> <p>6 represented their evaluation of that. As part of this</p> <p>7 evaluation here, I have just got the specific report</p> <p>8 that I have looked at and then, again, my discussions</p> <p>9 with Dr. Schreüder regarding that.</p> <p>10 Q. You just mentioned the report you looked at.</p> <p>11 What report is that?</p> <p>12 A. This is Exhibit 2 that I was referring to.</p> <p>13 (Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked.)</p> <p>14 Q. (BY MR. GRUNEWALD) Do you mean the N-CORPE</p> <p>15 proposal from Nebraska?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Thank you. You mentioned you had a</p> <p>18 discussion with Dr. Schreüder about this reach being a</p> <p>19 gaining reach. Can you tell me what you discussed</p> <p>20 specifically?</p> <p>21 A. All I recall, in the context of that being a</p> <p>22 gaining reach, is his evaluation of the model outputs</p> <p>23 that Nebraska had provided and my request of him to</p> <p>24 determine whether their operations created any impact to</p> <p>25 Colorado. And it was in that context that we discussed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 of today, but there may have been some reference to</p> <p>2 those during some of the discussions at the workshop. I</p> <p>3 just don't recall them.</p> <p>4 Q. Did you review any of those studies that</p> <p>5 might exist when you were preparing your joint expert</p> <p>6 report?</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Did Dr. Schreüder review any of those?</p> <p>9 A. I don't know.</p> <p>10 Q. If you could turn to Exhibit 2, which is the</p> <p>11 N-CORPE proposal, and go to page 6 for me, please.</p> <p>12 A. I'm there.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you see in basically the middle of the</p> <p>14 page there's two sets of equations that are titled as</p> <p>15 referring to the RRCA accounting procedures? Do you see</p> <p>16 those?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. The first equation under both of those</p> <p>19 headings begins with the term "VWS." What is that term?</p> <p>20 A. Virgin water supply.</p> <p>21 Q. Thank you. And after the equals sign, the</p> <p>22 very first term in that equation is the word "gauge."</p> <p>23 Could you tell me what you understand that term to mean?</p> <p>24 A. That is the stream flow that's recorded at</p> <p>25 that gauging station on Medicine Creek.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 the gaining reach and to what extent that was or was not</p> <p>2 a factor in those determinations.</p> <p>3 Q. After water flows into Harry Strunk</p> <p>4 Reservoir, can you tell me where water goes downstream</p> <p>5 of that as it moves through the Republican River Basin?</p> <p>6 A. Medicine Creek is a tributary to the main</p> <p>7 stem, and as it's released out of there, it would make</p> <p>8 its way down to the main stem and then flow on</p> <p>9 downstream through Nebraska and ultimately into Kansas.</p> <p>10 Q. Are there any other reservoirs downstream on</p> <p>11 either tributaries of the main stem downstream of Harry</p> <p>12 Strunk Reservoir?</p> <p>13 A. I guess I am not clear on your question.</p> <p>14 Could you rephrase that again, please, to make sure I</p> <p>15 understand your question.</p> <p>16 Q. Is there a reservoir on the main stem</p> <p>17 downstream of where Medicine Creek joins the main stem?</p> <p>18 A. Harlan County Reservoir is downstream.</p> <p>19 Q. Will there be any transit losses, physical</p> <p>20 losses of augmentation water, as it moves downstream</p> <p>21 from Harry Strunk Reservoir to Harlan County Reservoir?</p> <p>22 A. I don't know.</p> <p>23 Q. Are you aware of any studies of that reach</p> <p>24 regarding losses of water or gains of water?</p> <p>25 A. I am not recalling any specific studies as</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 Q. And does Nebraska's proposal involve making</p> <p>2 any changes in the accounting procedures to that gauge</p> <p>3 term?</p> <p>4 A. I don't think specific to the gauge term.</p> <p>5 They do make a -- in their examples here, a</p> <p>6 consideration of the change in the CBCU that is adjusted</p> <p>7 to that gauge flow for their prediction here in their</p> <p>8 example, but I am not aware that they have adjusted the</p> <p>9 gauge factor itself, per se.</p> <p>10 Q. You mentioned CBCU adjustment. I wanted to</p> <p>11 make sure I understood. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>12 A. Well, they were just trying to, in their</p> <p>13 example here with the operation of the Medicine Creek</p> <p>14 project or N-CORPE, what the projected change would be</p> <p>15 in the gauge flow, because that's where it's recorded,</p> <p>16 and trying to demonstrate through these calculations</p> <p>17 what the ultimate determination would be on the</p> <p>18 allocations to both Nebraska and Kansas and ultimately</p> <p>19 the balance to Nebraska on the Medicine Creek Subbasin.</p> <p>20 So they were just assuming that there would</p> <p>21 be that increase in this example of 100 acre-feet in the</p> <p>22 CBCU. So that would indicate that the gauge would be</p> <p>23 reduced down under the operations. Instead of recording</p> <p>24 at a thousand, at some point it would be showing 900.</p> <p>25 And so they just made that adjustment accordingly in</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">18</p> <p>1 this example. That's the adjustment that I guess I was 2 referring to. 3 It's just for this example calculation. 4 It's not an adjustment in the accounting procedures to 5 the gauge factor itself. It's just for this example 6 calculation, is what I was referring to in that 7 adjustment. 8 Q. Thank you. If you could flip to page 1 of 9 the proposal. 10 A. Okay. 11 Q. I'm sorry. I apologize. I meant page 1 of 12 your report. 13 A. Okay. 14 Q. Down there at the bottom, the last 15 paragraph, the last sentence, it says, "Nebraska 16 addressed all of Colorado's questions during the 17 workshop." Do you see that? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Can you tell me, what were those questions? 20 A. I don't remember the specific questions. As 21 I recall, generally what those represented were just 22 getting clarification on operations, accounting, as it 23 was presented in the report. 24 Q. So you don't remember any specific 25 questions?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">20</p> <p>1 A. Given it's been a while since I read that 2 decision -- it was right after it was issued -- I did 3 not make that analysis of the Rock Creek decision by 4 Mr. Fereday and this specific proposal to make the 5 determination, to answer your question. I would have to 6 go back and again refresh myself on that decision to 7 make that comparison that you suggest in your question. 8 Q. Do you have any plans to do that in the 9 future before this arbitration on the N-CORPE project is 10 done? 11 A. It's possible. 12 Q. It's possible you have plans, or you don't 13 have any plans but it's possible that it will happen? 14 A. The reason I guess I respond the way I did 15 was, as it has been with all of these projects, there 16 continue to be discussions and settlement discussions, 17 if you will, as these projects move forward or the 18 processes associated with them. 19 And it's been my experience that Colorado 20 has done this, and I would suspect Nebraska could 21 continue to offer up additional terms and conditions or 22 alternatives to address concerns of either of the 23 states. 24 And it's in that context that those 25 evaluations may require going in and looking at other</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">19</p> <p>1 A. I apologize. I am not recollecting the 2 specific questions. But as I recall from that, the 3 general nature of those questions was, again, just 4 making sure we understood the operation of the project 5 and the specific accounting that Nebraska had proposed 6 in regards to the accounting procedures, again, just to 7 affirm our understanding of how the project was going to 8 operate. 9 We wanted to ensure, before I took a vote on 10 this, that I clearly understood how they were going to 11 operate the project. And so, again, I think they were 12 intended to be -- or I recollect that they were 13 principally clarifying questions for myself. 14 Q. Thank you. Just a couple more questions and 15 I think we are done with the report. The states 16 recently concluded an arbitration regarding another 17 augmentation plan or proposal from Nebraska on 18 Rock Creek in Nebraska. Do you remember that? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. The arbitrator issued a decision in late 21 December on that dispute. Did you read that decision? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. In your opinion, does anything in Nebraska's 24 N-CORPE proposal need to be changed as a result of the 25 Rock Creek arbitration decision?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">21</p> <p>1 decisions that have been made -- in this case, 2 Mr. Fereday's decision on Rock Creek -- and to the 3 extent there's decisions in there that would be 4 applicable to the N-CORPE project, I would say that 5 would be why I would consider looking at that as part of 6 that evaluation on any future modifications to this 7 proposal if Nebraska were to submit any. 8 MR. GRUNEWALD: Thank you. I don't have any 9 more questions. 10 MR. STEINBRECHER: Nebraska, do you have any 11 questions? 12 MR. WILMOTH: No, we don't. 13 MR. STEINBRECHER: Nothing from Colorado. 14 MR. GRUNEWALD: We can go off the record. 15 (WHEREUPON, the deposition concluded at 9:36 a.m.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>1 I, DICK WOLFE, P.E., do hereby certify 2 that I have read the foregoing transcript and that the 3 same and accompanying correction sheets, if any, 4 constitute a true and complete record of my testimony. 5 6 7 8 9 10 () No changes () Amendments attached 11 12 Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13 _____ day of _____, 2014. 14 15 My commission expires _____. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 df 24 N-CORPE Augmentation Plan 25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO 2 2170 South Parker Road, Suite 263 3 Denver, Colorado 80231 4 January 17, 2014 5 6 SCOTT STEINBRECHER, ESQ. 7 Colorado Department of Law 8 Natural Resources and Environment 9 Federal and Interstate Water Unit 10 Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center 11 1300 Broadway, 7th Floor 12 Denver, Colorado 80203 13 14 Case Name: N-CORPE Augmentation Plan 15 Deposition of DICK WOLFE, P.E. 16 The deposition in the above-entitled matter is ready 17 for reading and signing. Please attend to this 18 matter by complying with ALL blanks checked below: 19 <u> X </u> arrange with us at (303)696-7680 to read and 20 sign the deposition in our office 21 22 OR (if applicable), 23 24 <u> X </u> have deponent read your copy; signing 25 attached original signature page and any amendment sheets. ____ read enclosed deposition, sign attached signature page and any amendment sheets. <u> X </u> within 30 days of the date of this letter. ____ by _____ due to a trial date of _____. Please be sure that the signature page and accompanying amendment sheets, if any, are signed before a notary public and returned to our office at the above address. If this matter has not been taken care of within said period of time, the deposition will be filed unsigned pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure. Thank you. Enclosures: (As above noted) cc: Christopher M. Grunewald, Esq.; Justin D. Lavene, Esq.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF COLORADO) 3) SS. 4 COUNTY OF DENVER) 5 I, Denise A. Freeman, do hereby certify 6 that I am a Registered Professional Reporter and 7 Notary Public within the state of Colorado; that 8 previous to the commencement of the examination, 9 the deponent was duly sworn by me to testify to the 10 truth. 11 I further certify that this deposition was 12 taken in shorthand by me at the time and place herein 13 set forth and was thereafter reduced to typewritten 14 form, and that the foregoing constitutes a true and 15 correct transcript. 16 I further certify that I am not related 17 to, employed by, nor of counsel for any of the parties 18 or attorneys herein, nor otherwise interested in the 19 result of the within action. 20 In witness whereof, I have affixed my 21 signature this 17th day of January, 2014. 22 23 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO 24 Denise A. Freeman 25 Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 PATTERSON REPORTING & VIDEO 2 2170 South Parker Road, Suite 263 3 Denver, Colorado 80231 4 January 17, 2014 5 CHRISTOPHER M. GRUNEWALD, ESQ. 6 Assistant Attorney General 7 Civil Litigation Division 8 Office of Attorney General Derek Schmidt 9 120 SW 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor 10 Topeka, Kansas 66612-1597 11 12 Dear Mr. Grunewald: 13 14 Re: Deposition of DICK WOLFE, P.E. 15 16 _____ Signed, no changes. 17 18 _____ Signed, with changes, copy attached. 19 20 _____ No signature required. 21 22 _____ Reading and signing not requested pursuant to 23 CRCP Rule 30(e). 24 _____ Signature waived. 25 <u> X </u> Forwarding original transcript unsigned; signature pages and/or amendments will be forwarded, if received. ____ Original exhibits included in ongoing notebook and will be filed with counsel at conclusion of discovery. ____ Via Email. Enclosures: (As above noted) cc: Scott Steinbrecher, Esq.; Justin D. Lavene, Esq.</p>