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MATTHEW ANDERS, P.G.,
having been called as a witness and duly sworn to tell the truth relating to said cause, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. KLAHN:
Q. Good morning, Matt. My name is Sarah Klahn.

I represent the City of Pocatello. We're on Day 2 of
the deposition, of your deposition in this matter.
MS. KLAHN: Colleen, do you have all of the
exhibits sitting there?
THE REPORTER: Yes.
(Exhibit 2 referenced.)
MS. KLAHN: Could you hand Mr. Anders Exhibit
2, which is the Fifth Methodology Order?
THE WITNESS: Yes, I have it.
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) Okay. The last time we had
quite a lot of discussion about the acres that are incorporated into the methodology order. And I'm looking specifically at paragraph 22 , which is on page 10 of Exhibit 2.
A. Yes, I'm there.
Q. One thing we didn't talk about, I mean, do you recall that the testimony you gave last time when we talked about the acres?
A. I do.
Q. Could you describe how the acres are used in determining any of the demand --
A. Okay.
Q. -- pieces of the methodology order?
A. Sure. So we take the acres and -- I should back up. We first calculate the crop water need. We take ET. We adjust it for precipitation. And then we also calculate the crop mix, which is the percentage of each crop type for each Surface Water Coalition member. And then we multiply that, the crop water need by the acreage for each crop and by each member.
Q. But after you do that calculation, if the crop
water need is lower than the diversions associated with the baseline year, don't you just use the baseline year?
A. Could you say that again?
Q. Sure. After you do the calculation you just
described for me for crop water need, if the crop water need value you derive is lower than the diversions associated with the baseline year, don't you just use the baseline year diversions, instead of the crop water need calculated?
A. I think what you are talking about is in the calculator. I don't remember on that. I remember -- I think I know what you're talking about on the calculator where we calculated over by each milestone. But I don't
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remember if we used the demand if the crop water need is slower -- or lower. Sorry.
Q. So if a particular canal company's acreage changes, if let's say the acreage goes up. So for whatever reason the Department accepts the information submitted by Canal Company X. The acres are larger than they were in the past. What impact does higher acres have on the calculation of the crop water need?
A. Higher acres would calculate -- would increase the reasonable in-season demand, which is the crop water need divided by the project efficiency. So as we're calculating the crop water need and increase in acres will increase that as well.
Q. So by the same token, if the Canal Company X
submits information that shows less fewer acres used than in the past, what will be the impact on determination of crop water need?
A. It will go down. Assuming, I guess in both cases, assuming everything is equal, other than just the change in acres that you suggested.
Q. Okay.
A. Because you could have less acres or more water intensive crops, and it could actually go up. But if you kept everything else the same, and we're just adjusting acres, that's what would happen.
Q. So at any point, and I think you might have answered this before, but let me just ask it to kind of close the loop on this series of questions. At any point when you are looking at the inputs to the crop water need calculation, do you ever go back and look at the decreed place of use as part of the check on the acres that are being claimed?
A. I think, if I understand it correctly, I think
that is when we are doing our initial, or we did our initial check on these permissible places of use, and we take out any acres that are outside of that.
Q. So that would be part of the initial review of
the data before you go into this crop water need calculation; is that right?
A. Yeah, we don't -- those shapefiles that we have, we did that back in 2014, and we're not getting new shapefiles. So we don't do that every year except for that analysis, except for Minidoka -- or I guess anybody that submits us a new shapefile, then we analyze it in that way. The only one that -- the only company that's been submitting on a regular basis is Minidoka. So normally that's the only one we're doing.
23 Q. So if the acres change, go up or down, and
24 that's what dictates the reasonable in-season demand,
25 why do you need a baseline year?
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A. At the beginning of the year, we don't have

2 any crop water need. We're using baseline year to forecast what demand will be. So in April, it is what we think the demand, and the crop water need, and the reasonable in-season demand is going to be for the entire season. We only use the baseline year for the portion of the season that we don't know.

So in July, we use the crop water need from April through June. But for the rest of the year, the June -- or the July through September, October time frame, we're using the baseline year. So as you progress through the season, the baseline year has less of an effect on the demand shortfall.
Q. So why can't you just use the crop water need in April if you have the acres and the crop mix? Why have a baseline year?
A. Could you repeat the first portion of that question?
Q. So why can't you just use your calculated crop water need in April? You have the acres. You know the crop mix. Why do you need a baseline year in April? A. Because when we do the April order, that is basically the first two weeks of April. We don't have any crop water need yet to use during that time. We start the first week of April.
Q. But you know generally what the crop mix is; right? I mean that's something you track?
A. Yes, we have to use the crop mix from the previous year. So we do know the crop mix. But we don't know the crop water need at that point, because that comes from ET.
Q. Were you aware that the shapefile submitted by

Twin Falls Canal Company has not been updated since 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. So what's the point of asking for a shapefile
for current acres if the shapefile is ten years old?
MR. BAXTER: Objection. It calls for a legal conclusion.

Mr. Anders, if you --
MS. KLAHN: I don't think so. I'm asking
technically. The last time he talked quite a lot about this kind of stuff.
MR. BAXTER: Objection. It calls for a legal conclusion.

Mr. Anders, if you know the answer, you can go ahead and answer it.
THE WITNESS: Could you repeat the question. Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) Why ask for shapefiles every year if you are not going to require the entity to
maintain current irrigated acres in the shapefile?
A. So I think we allow them, or there is two
options that they have. They could submit a shapefile, or they can submit a letter that says their acres from the previous year haven't changed by more than five percent.
Q. But I'm saying based on what I understood from the testimony of Mr. Barlogi yesterday, they don't do any evaluation. They just send you a shapefile. They say, okay. It's the same. We're pretty sure it's the same?
A. I don't think they even send us a shapefile.

We just have that shapefile from 2013. They just send a letter.
Q. So from the standpoint of being the
administrators who are supposed to be distributing water to seniors on the acres that are actually being irrigated, why is that acceptable from a technical perspective? How do you know that you're actually calculating demand when you don't actually know what the acres are?
MR. BAXTER: Objection; a compound question. Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) You can answer it.

MR. BAXTER: If you understand the question, you can answer it, Mr. Anders.

1 THE WITNESS: Those -- that's the best acres that we have at that point. We --
3 Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) So --
4 A. Go ahead.
5 Q. I'm sorry. Go ahead. I didn't mean to
interrupt you.
A. No, I -- we, from a technical standpoint, we
would like better data, but that is the best data that we have.
Q. And last time we talked about how the

Department has insufficient resources to do its own evaluation of acreage for the Surface Water Coalition; is that right?

MR. BAXTER: Objection. It mischaracterizes previous testimony.
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) Well, characterize it however you want. That was my understanding. Correct me.
A. Could you repeat the question?
Q. Last time we talked about how the Department has insufficient resources to do its own evaluation of irrigated acreage for the Surface Water Coalition lands. If that's not a correct characterization, tell me what you meant?
24 A. I think that at this point, yes, we haven't
25 invested or dedicated the resources to get it to where
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we would like it to be, which is something timely and accurate.
Q. And you haven't insisted that the seniors
provide current acreage; correct?
A. I think the word "insisted," we have not insisted.
Q. And to the extent that there is available
information that the juniors could develop to provide
accurate acres, is that the sort of thing that the
Department would consider?
A. Yeah, I think we would consider any data that
we receive.
Q. So from the standpoint of our discussion of acreage, I just want to make sure I'm clear. There is a component of the crop water need for the adjustments later in the season that requires acreage. But at the April determination, acreage is not relevant to the Department's calculation of whether or not there is a shortage; is that right?
A. We just use the forecast supply and the
baseline year, yes, there is no acreage calculation there in the April order.
23 Q. Mr. Anders, who have you talked to about this
24 deposition since we met last time?
25 A. I talked to legal counsel. I talked to other
staff in IDWR just generally, how did it go, what did they ask. I talked to Kara Ferguson. I think I talked to Sean Vincent. I think Mat Weaver stopped by and asked. But generally, they were just informal, how did it go? What were they interested in knowing? What were they interested in you talking about?
Q. Did you prepare for today?
A. Yes.
Q. How did you prepare?
A. I read through the transcript from the
deposition two weeks ago as I was requested for errors or anything. I reviewed my notes that I prepared, which was distributed to the parties. I reviewed the orders a little bit. That's about all.
Q. Did you talk with legal counsel?
A. Yeah.
Q. Why did you review the orders?
A. Just to refresh my memory. The Fifth

Methodology Order is very long, and in places it's complicated. Just to refresh my memory so that I remembered kind of the pieces that we talk about in the order. And the same with the as-applied is relatively short compared to the Fifth Methodology. But just to remind myself of what we talked about in there.
Q. When you reviewed the transcript from two
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weeks ago, did you find any answers to questions that you gave that you disagree with now?
A. I did as I went through preparing things for discovery, and then read that transcript. I determined that I was inaccurate about the first review that I referred to in the deposition as the 2021 review. And I think I talked to you about it. And I think I talked to TJ about it.
Q. And how were you inaccurate in your testimony on May 12th on that topic?
A. So the questioning that I remember was that when did you start working on reviewing the methodology for a possible amendment to the Fourth Methodology. And I stated at that time that I thought we started in August or, you know, late 2021, August, sometime around there.

In doing the discovery, I started looking at file dates, and, you know, when we were doing some of this. And I determined that we started talking about a review baseline year and forecast supply in around the time that we did the April order in 2020. And it really was focusing on Box Canyon and was that, you know, the regressions for Twin Falls Canal Company working correctly or the way we thought they were. And then was the baseline years still performing the way we wanted to
perform.
And we talked kind of on and off, internally
Kara and I talked during the summer. And then maybe in the October time frame, we started doing the review.
And then we reviewed forecast supply and baseline year and near real-time metric as possible things to upgrade -- or update or amend -- I'm sorry -- the Fourth Methodology Order.

And we worked on that through from October to about February. We did present our findings to the Director. And then at that point we stopped kind of our formal check in review in April -- or I'm sorry -- in February of 2021. And then there was a break. We may have kind of worked on it, Kara and I kind of informally on our own a little bit, but nothing formally until the fall or late summer of 2022.

So where I was inaccurate was I thought it started in -- we started working on it in the fall of 2021. It was actually the fall of 2020 . But the general outline was the same.
21 Q. And you derived that timeline from a
conversation with someone?
A. No, that was looking -- Kara and I had a
conversation as we were preparing, you know, finding documents for discovery that were requested by the
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parties. And we started talking about when that review started, and then started the looking at file dates, and like on Excel files, and things like that. So it was between Kara and I as we were doing discovery that I realized that.
Q. And you used the term "doing discovery" a few times. What are you referring to there?
A. The documents requested --
Q. Okay.
A. -- by the parties. I've gotten -- I don't
know what you call them. I don't know what the legal term is. But something from the parties that are listed on our website, you know, we're asking for this, this, and this. We went through it during my other -- at the beginning of my last deposition, like we're asking for this, we're asking for that.

And so as we're fulfilling those things, you know, following up. And I think there were some additional ones in addition to that list. As we're trying to get all that out, that's when. So that's what I'm talking about in discovery.
22 Q. Okay. So the last time we talked about the
23 documents that were listed in your subpoena --
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. -- the document categories that were listed in
your subpoena. And then I think subsequent to that, there was what we call a request for production. And that was a separate, not deposition related requests. Does that ring a bell at all?
A. Yes. In my mind, it's all connected.
Q. That's okay.
A. But you guys may have different legal terms for that.
Q. And so you were involved in pulling the documents together for the requests for production?
A. Some of them. There were other sections as well that produced things.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. KLAHN: So I would like the court reporter to hand you and Garrick a document that we marked as Exhibit 47 and Exhibit 48. Colleen, if you could find those.
(Exhibits 47 and 48 marked.)
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) These were the documents that were produced to us, among the documents that were produced to the ground water interests in response to the requests for production. And I will say for the record, that we pre-marked these with exhibit numbers just to make it easier for the court reporter to identify what we were talking about.
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1 And so at the end of the deposition, we can maybe talk about how to deal with the gap, Colleen, and lawyers, because I think there is a gap between the deposition exhibits that got marked yesterday and the starting point for ours. But anyway, we'll worry about that later.

So I would like you to look at Exhibit 47, which is an email?
A. Yes, I have Exhibit 47.
Q. And that's an email from Mat Weaver to Gary

Spackman copying you. Do you recall seeing this document or this email rather?
A. Yeah, it looks familiar.
Q. Then I'd like you to look at Exhibit 48. And I will represent to you that Exhibit 48 was attached to this email, Exhibit 47, that we received from the Department in requests for production, in response to the requests for production. So Exhibit 48 was attached to the email, which is marked as Exhibit 47.
A. Okay.
Q. And could you read the message at the top of Exhibit 47 from Mat Weaver to Gary Spackman?
A. It says, "Find attached the draft document.

Gary, I understand that you will take the first review and edit. Matt and I will be ready to respond following
initial edits."
Q. And then Exhibit 48 was the attachment. Now, I've been through Exhibit 48, and it looks to me like it is simply a Word version of the Fourth Amended Methodology Order. Do you have any way of taking a look at that and telling me if that's correct? I didn't see any edits in this.
A. Just looking through it, I don't see any edits in it. But this follows our normal process of how we edit as-applied, and how we edit an order. We ask legal to provide the final word version from last time. They keep that. We don't keep any of that.

Most of these, I think they all come out as PDFs. So we don't want to start with the PDF and edit. We want to start with the Word document. So this would be how we would normally start the process.
Q. Okay. So on January 3rd, Gary was provided
the final Fourth Amended Final Order, Methodology Order. And the normal workflow was Gary would have taken that and started editing it; is that right?
A. It varies. It varies based on what he wants
to do. We might take the first edits. He may ask technical staff to start editing, or he could do it himself. It's up to him about how he wants it to go.
Q. Do you recall how it went with regard to this
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email exchange, January 3rd, 2023?
A. Yes. What I remember he asked for the Word document. I don't think he asked me. I didn't see anything before this email. He asked for the Word document, and then it was provided to him.
Q. Do you recall when you got Gary's initial edits?
A. Yeah, it was a while when we got those. I'm just estimating here, probably late January time frame is when we started. He asked us to then look at his edits, and then start proposing our own.
Q. How many times did you exchange drafts with
the Director before April 21st?
A. I don't know that number, but many.
Q. Do you remember when in the process the
transient modeling approach was included in the draft?
A. I don't know the exact date. It would have
been after Gary gave it back to technical staff, meaning Kara and Jennifer and I, to start doing our edits. And then we would have coordinated between the three of us about who's working on it. And Jennifer would have made those edits. I don't know exactly when she did, but it would have been after we got it back, sometime after late January or February sometime is my estimate.
25 Q. So as of December 23rd, 2022, you and

Jennifer, you and Kara I guess were not recommending adopting the transient modeling approach; isn't that right?

MR. BAXTER: Objection; a leading question.
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) If I'm wrong, tell me?
A. Kara and I wouldn't recommend, yes or no on transient. That is Jennifer's specialty.

MS. KLAHN: So does somebody know what the exhibit number is for the December 23rd, 2022, recommendations, just so we can look at that? I may have it here, actually. We marked it during the last deposition.

MS. PATTERSON: Depo Exhibit 4, the staff recommendation, the one pager.

MS. KLAHN: Thank you. Yes.
(Exhibit 4 referenced.)
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) Could you hand that to the witness? Thanks.
A. Yes, I have -- well, wait a minute. That's
the letter on December 23rd?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. So if you would go down to the next to the
last paragraph, Matt.
5 A. "At this time," it starts?

1 Q. Yes. Yeah.
A. Okay.
Q. And it says, at this time staff do not have
recommendations on using -- and I'm skipping a little bit -- but on using transient model simulation for determining curtailment priority dates?
A. That is correct. I see that, yeah.
Q. And so as of December 23rd, 2022, you weren't
recommending, the "you" meaning whoever in the group is that authored this, but it's you and Kara on the title. You didn't have recommendations about imposing transient modeling simulation; is that right?
A. Yes. This letter came out under Kara's name and my name. Jennifer had input on it, and would have made, you know, edits to this document. We didn't make a recommendation, because it was a legal and a technical question.
Q. Okay. So when you got the draft back from Gary sometime after January 3rd, 2023, were you directed at that point to include the transient model simulations in the order?

MR. BAXTER: Sarah, I'm going to object at this particular point in time. I've been very flexible up to this point to let you explore the process in which the Director has worked with staff. But I think we're
crossing the line here that you are asking specific questions as to the Director's deliberative process on legal and policy issues.

And so, Matt, I'm going to instruct you not to answer the question because it gets to the Director's deliberative process, and is inconsistent with the Director's order limiting the scope of depositions in this matter.

The next question, Sarah, if we could.
MS. KLAHN: Yes, let's let Colleen give the remainder of the exhibits to Matt and Garrick.
(Exhibit 40 marked.)
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) So could you take a look at

Exhibit 40, Matt?
A. Yep, I have Exhibit 40.

16 Q. Okay. I'll represent to you that this Exhibit
40 came from an email. It was an attachment to an email from Mat Weaver. And I have some questions about it. But first of all, I want you to please take a look at it. And let me know if you've ever seen it?
A. I don't know that I've seen it in this form
with the red and the black. I think this is the talking points possibly a press release. I don't -- I did not edit it.
25 Q. The title is "Settlement Agreement Small Group
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1 Meeting." What settlement does this refer to?
A. Sorry. I totally -- my answer before was
inaccurate. I thought this was the discussion points
just on the press release that we made for the Fifth
Amended Methodology Order. My apologies there.
6 Q. That's okay.
A. Could you repeat the question?

8 Q. Yeah. The title is "Settlement Agreement
Small Group Meeting, Main Discussion Points."
A. Okay.
Q. What settlement agreement does this refer to?
A. I wasn't involved. I assume this is the
settlement agreement for the Surface Water Coalition between IGWA and the Surface Water Coalition, but I don't -- I'm not positive on that.
Q. Would you turn to the last page?
A. Yep.

18 Q. There is some red font there at the very
bottom, the words, the two paragraphs start after the word "Scott." And I believe that's Lieutenant Governor Scott Bedke, that's who that's being addressed to. If you go down to the last paragraph. Could you read that, please, just read it into the record?
24 A. On our version, it's on two pages; is that
25 correct? The one where it says, "One component"?
Q. It's on two pages?
A. Yeah, it's on the second -- it starts on the
second to the last page. And you originally said "on
the last page." So I'm just making sure --
Q. It may be because of just when we added the exhibit numbers, it sort of scooted some things down.
A. Okay.
Q. So it says "Scott," and then there is two
paragraphs regardless of which page it's on; is that right?
A. Yes, it is. And the second one starts with
the "One component not described"?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. You want me to read that.
Q. Yes, please.
A. "One component not described in the
methodology is the historical practice of running the ESPAM in steady state to establish the priority curtailment date. In Idaho, it is settled law that mitigation activities must mitigate for material injury in time, location, and quantity. Does IDWR's current state method, comply with the timing component of injury determination and mitigation? IDWR is reconsidering this issue and it could have very large implications on the methodology and mitigation. This issue is one to
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keep in your back pocket for now."
Q. So was the decision made to impose the
transient modeling approach after the negotiations between the Surface Water Coalition and IGWA broke down?
A. I think that decision was being considered
through the fall at least. I think the decision was,
you know, it finally was made after in the January,
February time frame when we started editing the order.
Q. I have a dog here, who has an opinion about
it. Sorry about that.
Do you know what this message means about
"keeping the issue in your back pocket for now"?
A. I do not.
Q. Who would be the best person to ask about the
information in this document?
A. I don't know.
Q. Well, it was on an email from Mat Weaver.

Would you expect Mat Weaver might know something about it?
A. If it was on his email, I would assume.
(Exhibit 41 marked.)
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) I would like you to turn to

Exhibit 41?
A. Okay. I have it.

5 Q. Take a look at Exhibit 41, which is titled

1 "Surface Water Coalition Steering Committee Meeting, July 13, 2022"?
3 A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. I'm sorry. I do have
that. I was reading the top.
Q. So does the Department participate in Surface

Water Coalition steering committee meetings?
A. Yes, I believe Brian Regan. There might be
other people, but I am pretty sure Brian Regan does
participate in that committee meeting.
Q. Have you seen this outline before that's
marked as Exhibit 41?
A. It looks like something that I would prepare.

I don't remember preparing this. But this does look like something that Kara and I would have put together kind of summarizing the elements of the methodology. It's very similar to a general presentation that we gave to Brian and the technical working group -- I meant for the Surface Water Coalition.
Q. When you say the "technical working group," do
you mean the one that convened in November and December of 2022?
A. Yes, that is the one I'm referring to.

23 Q. Okay. And you say it's very similar to a
general presentation that we gave to Brian and the technical working group? So the Brian part of that
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1 would have been a separate presentation, or did Brian participate in the technical work group?
A. We gave Brian a separate -- and we've met with

Brian from time to time to try to, you know, bring him -- make him aware of what the methodology is, and what we're doing in our section. So we met with him around this time, and we gave him a presentation that was kind of an overview of the methodology.

And it was a very similar presentation that we gave to the technical working group. I think we cut out a couple of slides that the technical working group already knew, like where the ground water districts are located, and things like that. But it was a very similar presentation.
(Exhibit 42 marked.)
6 Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) And then take a look at
Exhibit 42. This is also titled "Surface Water
Coalition, Steering Committee Meeting, July 13th, 2022." 9 A. Okay.
20 Q. But it has the subheading heading "Speaking
21 Outline."
22 A. Okay. I see it.
23 Q. Have you seen this document before?
24 A. I don't think I've seen this document before,
25 but it seems to be similar to the Exhibit 41.
Q. Do you have any recollection if you had any involvement in creating it?
A. I don't remember creating this. But it may
have been based on if I did create, or help create
Exhibit 41, I may have been indirectly involved.
(Exhibits 43, 44, and 45 marked.)
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) Okay. And I would like you to
just take Exhibits 43, 44, and 45, and lay them out in
front of you.
A. Okay. I have them laying side by side.
Q. So Exhibit 43 is an email string from Garrick

Baxter to Gary Spackman, Mat Weaver, Matt Anders, copying I think another lawyer at the time, Mark
Cecchini-Beaver. I'm not sure how to say his name. And the top is blacked out. And then there is an email from TJ Budge to Garrick below that. Do you see that?
A. I do. That's Exhibit 43.
Q. Yes. And let me just ask. Do you recall this email exchange?
A. Yeah, I'm familiar with this.
Q. Okay. And then just in order to get sort of the timing pieces in front of us, if you look at Exhibit 44, it's another email from Garrick to Gary Spackman, Mat Weaver, Matt Anders, and Mark Cecchini-Beaver from later in the same day, of September 30, 2022, with a
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bunch of blacked out redactions. Would you agree that this is part of the same email chain as Exhibit 43 from the look of it?
A. Yes, it appears to be a continuation of Exhibit 43.
Q. And then Exhibit 45 is another email from

Garrick Baxter to Gary Spackman, Mat Weaver, Matt
Anders, Mark Cecchini-Beaver, again from September 30,
2022, but now at 2:38 in the afternoon, with a one line email from Gary Spackman entered in between the earlier emails.

And would you take a look at that. And just tell me if you think it looks like the entirety of the email chain from starting with Exhibit 43 is contained on Exhibit 45?
A. 43,44 , and 45 appear to be the same, you
know, email chain just at different times. I don't know if it's the complete email chain, but it does appear to be a --
Q. That's fair.
A. -- continuation.
Q. That's fair. I wanted to just establish that
so we could just work from Exhibit 45. Because it does appear to me to contain the same messages back and forth with the most extent of the messages.
into the record. But just take a look at TJ's email message and read that to yourself, please?
A. (Witness complying.) Okay. I have read it.
Q. Okay. My question is, from your perch as the technical person integrated into the methodology order, what discussions has the Department had about developing a framework for methodology order updates that would take things like the Administrative Procedures Act requirements into account?

MR. BAXTER: Objection. It calls for a legal conclusion.

To the extent you can answer, Mr. Anders, you can answer it.

THE WITNESS: I haven't been a part of any discussions or meetings.
Q. (BY MS. KLAHN) In your own work have you ever considered the value of having a time step check-in with the parties about issues in the methodology order, maybe
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say, just making this up, like every two years check in to say, "Hey, let's have some technical work groups, and talk about how things are going?" Has that ever been something that you've ever considered?
A. On a technical level?

6 Q. Uh-huh.
A. Yeah, Kara and I have had discussions about having -- it would be beneficial to have input from the consultants. Many of them are very good at this, you know, at the methodology and understanding what's happened. IDWR has many -- not "many" -- we have several technical working groups where we work with outside parties. So it would be beneficial, I think, on a technical level. Yes.
Q. Has there ever been any mention of some sort of approach like that from any of the leadership in the Department, Mat Weaver, Gary Spackman?
A. I don't remember that Kara and I have ever approached them with that idea.
Q. And they haven't approached you with it; is that right?
A. Not that I remember.

MS. KLAHN: I have maybe one or two more questions. And I would suggest we take like a ten-minute break, so I can make sure that I've got
everything that I need to get asked asked. Does that sound okay? Come back at 11:05?

MR. BAXTER: So just so I understand, do you want to break now, and then come back with your questions, or did you want to ask your last few questions, and then break? I was unsure.

MS. KLAHN: I want to break first.
MR. BAXTER: That's fine. That works for me. MS. KLAHN: Thank you.
(Recess.)
MS. KLAHN: Mr. Anders, I don't have any
further questions at this time. To the extent that the district court vacates the hearing in ten days, whenever it is, and we get a more reasonable hearing schedule, we may want to bring you back to ask you a few more questions. But I am done for today. And I'm going to pass the baton to whoever wants to go next. Thank you for your time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. McHUGH: This is Candice. I have just a couple lines of questions that won't take very long. I don't know who else might have any questions. But does anybody care if I go next?

MS. KLAHN: Go for it. ///
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1 EXAMINATION
2 QUESTIONS BY MS. McHUGH:
Q. I am not in a place where I can do video. But can you hear me fine, Matt?
A. Yes, I can hear you.
Q. Okay. Just for the record, I'm Candice

McHugh. I represent the Coalition of Cities in this matter.

I just want to go back and make sure I understood your answers to Ms. Klahn's questions about crop water need. And correct me, I'm truly just trying to figure out what really is going on. My understanding is that in the summer, the Department uses ET and acres in order to determine whether or not there is going to be a potential bigger shortage in July, or a less of the shortage that was forecast; is that correct?
A. Yeah, we use ET for crop water need. We use

ET precipitation. And then the acreage of the separate, of the individual crops.
Q. Okay. And then my understanding is that Twin

Falls Canal Company has used the same acres and crop mix since 2013; is that true?
A. The same acres it does maybe -- I think it was since 2013, but it might have been 2015, something right in there. The crop mix is updated every year to the
previous -- to the previous year.
Q. And does Twin Falls update their crop mix to
you?
A. We update that. That's a calculation we do.

5 Q. And that calculation is done how?
6 A. So we get from the Department of Ag, we
download a data set called the "crop data layer." That
comes out at the end -- or in January for the previous
irrigation season. So this year, we will be using, for
example, we'll be using the 2022 crop data layer to establish the crop mix for each of the Surface Water Coalition members.
13 Q. For 2023?
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. And that's used in July?
16 A. Yep, it's used in July, and then at the time
of need, and then in November, when we do our final calculation.
Q. Okay. And if Twin Falls Canal Company's
acreage has stayed the same, and you have that crop mix that you are using in January, why can't you just use that in April, and essentially just change your forecasts supply to determine whether or not Twin Falls Canal Company is going to suffer injury?
25 A. The other part of that -- two other variables
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in the crop water need calculation are ET and precipitation. And they are what's happening during the irrigation season. So when we make our calculation on April 1st, or around the first week of April, we don't have any ET or precipitation data for the irrigation season yet. So we can't calculate crop water need.
Q. Okay. So let's say in January, you received
from the Department of Ag this -- what did you call that data layer again?
A. Crop data layer.
Q. Crop data layer. Have you ever done any analysis on that crop data layer for Twin Falls in particular, and compared whether or not, you know, the 2022 crop data layer looks significantly different than the 21 , and the ' 20 , and the ' 19 , or whether or not they look fairly consistent --

MR. BAXTER: Objection.
Q. (BY MS. McHUGH) -- and see if they look very different? Have you looked at that?

MR. BAXTER: Objection; a compound question.
Q. (BY MS. McHUGH) You can answer, if you understood my question.
A. Yeah, we analyze it every year, and the
results go into an Excel file. And then we always monitor, was there a big change from the previous year,
like an abnormal change, something that we would consider out of the ordinary. Like maybe one of the crop mix for, or the crop acreage for, or the percentage for alfalfa tripled or something like that. We would analyze it for that just general QA/QC.
Q. Okay. And when you analyzed it for that and you've compared one year to the next, have you seen any dramatic changes, or are they about the same each year?
A. No, we don't see dramatic changes, but we do see a change over time. That data set was an Excel file that we distributed to the parties for the discovery phase of this hearing. And each year, we put that out in July and in November, that whole file. So people can see what it is.

But we do see over time a change in a trend, like more of a trend change, not an abrupt change in different -- what the crop mix is for Twin Falls Canal Company.
Q. Okay. And we did hear some testimony yesterday from their manager. Is it fair that you would agree to say that change over time has become more alfalfa, a more water intensive crop?
A. I would agree. When I did my kind of trend analysis on it, I saw more alfalfa, more field corn, and a little bit more potatoes. All three of those are more
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intensive crops, are water intensive crops.
Q. And what would be the Department's reaction, in your opinion, if in January, you looked at the data and there was a sudden and abrupt change to a significant amount -- I'm going to say, and I know this is kind of ridiculous number, but I'm just trying to do this as proof purposes of an example. If suddenly they, you know, did 30 percent more alfalfa in 2022 than they did in 2021. What would you do with that if that did happen?

MR. BAXTER: Objection. It's a compound question. Objection. It's asking the witness to speculate. Goodness, there is one more in there. I can't remember what it was now. To the extent you can -- oh, and lacks foundation. That's what it was. Q. (BY MS. McHUGH) Do you understand what I'm asking you?

MR. BAXTER: Go ahead and answer the question.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think. I think the first thing we would do is take a closer look at the data set, and see if there was something obvious that happened. If we had the data wrong, or we analyzed it wrong. If it looked like the data were correct, we would probably call Twin Falls Canal Company, the manager, and ask them, does this seem -- does this seem
realistic? Is that what you saw, or what you think happened?
Q. (BY MS. McHUGH) And let's say the answer is, yes. The Twin Falls manager said, yes, a whole bunch of people put in a whole lot more alfalfa. What would it do, if anything, to the Department's analysis on the
Twin Falls Canal Company?
MR. BAXTER: Objection. It calls for speculation on behalf of the witness.

Mr. Anders, if you know the answer you can, answer the question.

THE WITNESS: If we thought the data were correct and accurate. We would use it in our calculation.
Q. (BY MS. McHUGH) And that calculation would be what occurred in July?
A. Starting in July, and then at the time of need, and at the end of the year, or in November, yes. Q. Okay. There was a line of questioning from

Ms. Klahn about a meeting between you and Kara in roughly fall of 2020 . Do you remember those questions? A. Yep, I do.

23 Q. Okay. And I think, if I understood your
testimony correctly, you were saying that you and Kara were discussing whether or not some things in the
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1 methodology should be reconsidered; is that correct? 2 A. Yeah, evaluating whether we needed to amend the Fourth Methodology Order.
Q. Okay. And can you remind me of what those three things were?
A. At that point, we were looking at baseline
year, forecast supply, and adding real-time metric to the methodology.
Q. Did you discuss changing the use of the model
to use a transient model run to predict curtailment dates?
A. Not that I remember.
Q. And who were you discussing this with?
A. Kara and I were discussing between the two of
us about what we thought possibly we should start looking at. We were also communicating with the Director about what we thought should be looked at, or possibly looked at.
Q. Anyone else?
A. Often in those meetings, legal counsel is
there, Mat Weaver is often in those meetings, if we did it through a meeting.
23 Q. And did you do it through a meeting?
24 A. Most likely.
25 Q. And in those meetings in the fall of 2020 when
you discussed those three items that you just told me about with the Director, did he essentially approve you to look at those or to create some sort of a task force within the agency? What was that process?

MR. BAXTER: Matt, I'm going to object to the question here. I think we are back in getting to the Director's deliberative process on legal and policy considerations here, which have been excluded by the Director as being outside the scope of this deposition. So I'm going to instruct you not to answer that question.

Ms. McHugh, go ahead and ask your next question, if you would, please.
Q. (BY MS. McHUGH) Okay. So when you and Kara discussed with each other the three items. One of them was real-time metric; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any conversations with Rick Allen
about ET, and how it might be used in real-time metric, and whether that would be helpful?
A. I don't remember in the fall of 2021 that we contacted Rick or anybody from his group. We've had a contract with Rick and his group to produce real-time, near real-time metrics since about 2016.
Q. And it was determined that real-time metrics
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shouldn't be used; would you agree?
A. That was determined in late 2022, around the time that we were doing the technical working group.
Q. And who made the decision to reject that?
A. Ultimately the Director made that decision.
Q. And did he communicate that to you?
A. Yeah, he did.
Q. And then did you communicate that to the
technical working group?
A. We did not recommend it in our December 23 rd summary.
Q. Was the use of real-time metrics a topic that was discussed within the technical working group?
A. It was. And at that time, I thought we -- I
thought it was a likely that we were going to do, try to put near real-time metric in the Fifth Methodology.
Q. What is your understanding as to why it was rejected?
A. It came down to staff time. So we had a contract with Rick Allen's group. And the contract was that they would produce it by the 5th of each month. So, for example, they would give us near real-time metric for April by the -- April is not a good example -- for May for April by the 5th of May, and then by the 5th of June, and by the 5th of July, and so
forth. And they had been doing that, and we were testing if we could get it done on time and accurately. Then that contract ended, and we took that process in-house. I don't know the exact date of that, but it was like in 2021 or 2022. So we were starting to work on it in-house. And we realized that we had one staff assigned to doing that. And in talking with that person, during the technical working group time -- we had been talking other times, but during the technical working group time during that meeting, we were starting to talk to him more about the effort that it took, and could he meet those deadlines of the 5th of each month, which is what we needed to do it in the methodology.

And based on his responses, we realized that it was a lot more staff time -- or a lot more of his time than we had. He estimated it was going to take about a month in some cases to get the July data ready. And we were -- we started getting nervous about whether we could actually reliably get it in time for the milestones of the methodology.
21 Q. And who is that staff member at the
Department?
23 A. Phil Blankenau.
24 Q. Was there any discussion because of that kind
25 of hurdle to just not amend the Fourth Methodology until
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that resource issue was addressed?
A. Not amend it at all, was that your question?
Q. Right.
A. No, I don't remember any conversation that
said we should wait on amending it until near real-time is ready, or we have some other alternative to use instead of near real-time metric.
Q. Is the Department currently addressing that
resource limitation?
A. Yeah, we're talking about if near real-time
metric is the best route to take. Phil has had discussions with us about, we want -- I guess our comment to him was is we want spatially distributed data if we can get it. And his response was, maybe near real-time metric isn't, in its current form, isn't the best option. He recommended maybe we need to rewrite the code, so we can streamline it and make it run faster. So that we can make the timelines that you need for the methodology. He also recommended maybe open ET, or another third-party source of spatially distributed precipitation and ET data.
2 Q. And why do you want spatially -- why do you
want to upgrade the spatially distributed data?
24 A. So right now we use ET and precipitation from
25 the Twin Falls AgriMet site, and the Rupert AgriMet
site. And we assume that those values for those two variables at those locations represent the ET and the precipitation throughout the Surface Water Coalition service areas. In some cases, for example, AFRD2, they have portions of their service area that might be 20, 30 miles from those stations. So we feel that there are other data sets available, that if we could get them more spatially distributed, we could get a more accurate crop water need calculation.

MS. McHUGH: Okay. I don't have any further questions. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
MR. BAXTER: Are there any more questions for Matt from the ground water folks?

MS. PATTERSON: Not from IGWA.
MR. BAXTER: Hearing nothing there, I guess Surface Water Coalition folks.

MR. SIMPSON: Yeah. Matt, I've got probably one quick question for you that came up.

MR. BAXTER: John says he has a quick
question. He's going to move tables here, so he's closer to the microphone.

Dylan.
MR. ANDERSON: This is Dylan. I don't have any questions.

MR. SIMPSON: Does Skylar have any? Let's just verify that.

MR. BAXTER: Skylar, you don't have any questions?

MR. ANDERSON: I think he told me beforehand that he didn't think he had questions for follow up, so...

MR. BAXTER: Thanks, Dylan.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. SIMPSON:
Q. Good morning, Matt.
A. Good morning.
Q. John Simpson for the Surface Water Coalition.

And I just had maybe just one question for you to
clarify. And I think you testified that you used the
prior year crop plan data layer for the current year crop mix; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Just so I'm clear, does the calculator spreadsheet also just use the prior year, or does it use the prior three years?
A. Oh, that's a good question, and a good
clarifying question. So what I do when I calculate the crop water need, I do use -- I process the most recent year, but then I add -- when I put it into the
calculator, I average the most recent three years. So you are correct. I was inaccurate in the way I stated that. So in the processor, I'm using an average of the crop mix for the last three years.
Q. Okay. Do you recall in Exhibit 2, which is
the Fifth Methodology Order, the proportionate share analysis relative to IGWA of the 75,200 acre-feet? A. I do recall that we do make one, yes.
Q. Yeah. And was that proportionate share
analysis simply to estimate the relative mitigation obligations of those two parties, or was there some other reason for that footnote in that proportionate share analysis?
A. That question should be for Jennifer Sukow.

She does that proportionate share. I'm not exactly sure about how she does it.

MR. SIMPSON: Okay. That's all the questions I have. Thanks.

MR. BAXTER: Kent or Travis, do you have any questions?

MR. FLETCHER: This is Kent. I don't have any. Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't either, Garrick.
Thanks.
MR. BAXTER: All right. I'm going to assume
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we're done then for today. Thank you everybody. Thank you, Colleen for coming here today.

MS. KLAHN: Thank you. And everybody have a nice weekend.

MS. McHUGH: I want a copy of the transcript.
This is Candice.
MS. KLAHN: I want one to.
MS. PATTERSON: IGWA would like a copy, also.
MR. SIMPSON: One for the Surface Water
Coalition, that's myself, Kent, and Travis. Thank you.
MR. JOHNS: We'll split the cost with you, if that's okay.

MR. SIMPSON: That's fine.
(Deposition concluded at 11:32 a.m.)
(Signature requested.)
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