SOUTH CAROLINA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 138

NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendant.

CERTIFIED COPY

TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE

BEFORE SPECIAL MASTER KRISTIN MYLES

Friday, March 14, 2008

Reported by: DANA M. FREED CSR No. 10602

JOB No. 84418

1	
1	
2	
3	
4	SOUTH CAROLINA,
5 [,]	Plaintiff,
6	vs. No. 138
7	NORTH CAROLINA,
8	Defendants.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Telephonic Conference before Special
15	Master Kristin Myles, beginning at 10:03 a.m. and
16	ending at 10:50 a.m. on Friday, March 14, 2008,
17	before DANA M. FREED, Certified Shorthand Reporter
18	No. 10602.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
L	

1	APPEARANCES :
2	
3	For SOUTH CAROLINA:
4	ASSISTANT DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL
	BY: ROBERT D. COOK
5	CHILDS CANTEY
	Post Office Box 11549
6	1000 Assembly Street, Room 519
_	Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549
7	803.734.3736
	agrcook@ag.state.sc.us
8	VELLOCC HUDED HANGEN MODD EVANG CELCEL DI LC
9	KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C. BY: DAVID C. FREDERICK
9	SCOTT ANGSTREICH
10	DAVID SARRATT
10	Attorneys at Law
11	1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400
	Washington, D.C. 20036
12	202.326.7900
	dfrederick@khhte.com
13	
	For NORTH CAROLINA:
14	
	NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
15	BY: CHRISTOPHER G. BROWNING
	MARC BERNSTEIN
16	JIM GULICK
17	Attorneys at Law
17	114 West Edenton Street
18	Raleigh, North Carolina 27602 919.716.6400
10	cbrowning@ncdoj.gov
19	
	For PROPOSED INTERVENOR DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC:
20	
	SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
21	BY: CARTER G. PHILLIPS
	Attorney at Law
22	1501 K Street, N.W.
	Washington, D.C. 20005
23	202.736.8270
	cphillips@sidley.com
24	
25	
l	

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued) 2 For PROPOSED INTERVENOR CATAWBA RIVER WATER SUPPLY 3 **PROJECT**: AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP 4 BY: THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN Attorney at Law 5 Robert S. Strauss Building 6 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 7 tgoldstein@akingump.com 8 For the CITY OF CHARLOTTE: 9 HOGAN & HARTSON LLP 10 BY: JAMES T. BANKS MICHAEL BOYD 11 PARKER THOMSON H. CHRISTOPHER BARTOLOMUCCI 12 Attorneys at Law 555 Thirteenth Street, N.W. 13 Washington, D.C. 20004 202.637.5600 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

03/14/08

1	Friday, March 14, 2008
2	10:03 a.m 10:50 a.m.
3	
4	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: This is Special
5	Master Myles. We're going to conduct roll call for
6	today's call, see if everybody's here. Why don't we
7	begin with South Carolina and North Carolina and then
8	proceed to the intervenors?
9	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick for
10	South Carolina. In my office are Scott Angstreich,
11	and David Sarratt.
12	MR. COOK: This is Bob Cook for
13	South Carolina along with Childs Cantey.
14	MR. BROWN: This is Chris Brown excuse me,
15	this is Chris Browning for North Carolina. With me in
16	my office is Jim Gulick, G-u-l-i-c-k, Marc, M-a-r-c
17	Bernstein, B-e-r-n-s-t-e-i-n, and Jennie Hauser,
18	H-a-u-s-e-r, first name J-e-n-n-i-e.
19	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Can we go back?
20	I think, for the court reporter, it would help to
21	spell some of the names of South Carolina. I think,
22	Mr. Frederick, I didn't quite catch the names that you
23	had said.
24	MR. FREDERICK: Sure. This is David
25	Frederick, F-r-e-d-e-r-i-c-k, along with Scott

03/14/08

,	
1	Angstreich, A-n-g-s-t-r-e-i-c-h. And David Sarratt,
2	S-a-r-r-a-t-t.
3	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Thank you.
4	MR. COOK: Bob Cook, C-o-o-k, along with
5	Childs Cantey, C-h-i-l-d-s, C-a-n-t-e-y.
6	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. Why don't we
7	just go to the intervenors then.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: This is Carter Phillips for
9	Duke Energy.
10	MR. BANKS: This is Jim Banks for the City of
11	Charlotte. On the phone and for Charlotte are
12	Mike Boyd, B-o-y-d, with the Charlotte City Attorney's
13	Office. Parker Thomson, T-h-o-m-s-o-n, and Chris
14	Bartolomucci, B-a-r-t-o-l-o-m-u-c-c-i. All with the
15	law firm of Hogan & Hartson for Charlotte.
16	MR. GOLDSTEIN: This is Tom Goldstein for
17	Catawba River Water Supply.
18	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. So it sounds
19	like we have everybody. Why don't we just I don't
20	think this call needs to take a lot of time. I just
21	thought we'd go through the agenda and discuss issues
22	including those raised by the parties' status reports
23	which were extremely helpful.
24	Does anybody have any issues they want to
25	raise first? Okay. Then why don't we move to item

I

03/14/08

1	number 1 on the agenda, the status conference reports.
2	Item number 1 was a very good question, and I thought
3	one that needs to be addressed right away, which is
4	the scope of the relief sought by South Carolina,
5	which I think correctly is framed by North Carolina as
6	by the it's framed by North Carolina as being
7	bounded by the complaint. And therefore, I think we
8	should have a resolution of that as soon as possible.
9	I think that's what makes sense to me to
10	do is to have a brief exchange of arguments. This
11	could be in the form of briefs or letter briefs, as
12	you've done here, simply addressing the question of
13	the scope of the complaint. Because I think the
14	pleading does dictate this issue. And if that's
15	incorrect, of course, that can be included in the
16	briefs. If I'm not correct to say that it's bounded
17	by the pleadings. But at least those two issues, is
18	it bounded by the pleadings and what do the pleadings
19	include, is something that ought to be resolved right
20	away.
21	So what I thought we could do is set up
22	a schedule for submissions on that issue and a
23	schedule for, if necessary, a probably a telephonic
24	hearing on that issue. So that we can because I
25	think resolution of that issue is going to affect all

1	other parts of the case, including the case management
2	plan.
3	So, what do people think in terms of, I mean,
4	this really goes primarily to the parties in terms of
5	time in which we could brief that issue?
6	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick for
7	South Carolina. Special Master Myles, was it your
8	thought that we might have this briefed and argued
9	prior to the March 28th hearing on the intervention
10	motions?
11	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: No, I didn't really
12	tie it to that at all.
13	MR. FREDERICK: Okay.
14	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I think that it should
15	be resolved expeditiously, but I don't think it needs
16	to be unless someone disagrees, I don't I don't
17	really see the relationship between that issue and the
18	issues to be discussed at that hearing.
19	I don't want to load too much into that
20	hearing, only because we already have three motions on
21	that day. So plausibly one could put that same issue
22	for discussion at the hearing on that day. I don't
23	have a problem with doing that, but I don't think
24	they're necessarily tied.
25	Do you have a view on whether that ought to

03/14/08

1 happen? 2 MR. FREDERICK: Well, for South Carolina, there are some efficiencies to having the scope of the 3 4 complaint argued while we're all together. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Uh-huh. 5 MR. GOLDSTEIN: Special Master Myles, this is 6 7 Mr. Goldstein. Related to that, it does seem to me 8 that the scope of the complaint could inform the question of the propriety of intervention and the 9 10 interest of the would-be intervenors, depending on 11 whether the remedy would be limited to flows in North Carolina, or instead North Carolina and 12 13 South Carolina, whether it would be limited to interbasin transfer or not could tell you a fair 14 15 amount about what stake the intervenors have. The would-be intervenors' stake is obviously not itself 16 17 determinative but it may be helpful. 18 SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I don't disagree with 19 My only, my main concern is timing. I don't that. 20 want to move the hearing. I don't want to delay that 21 hearing any further. And I think that -- I suppose if 22 people can get their briefs in relatively soon, we can 23 have that issue teed up for the hearing. But that 24 somewhat depends on when the parties can get their

25

submissions in on that.

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

1	MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning. I'm
2	assuming that the scheduling on that would be that
3	South Carolina would file their brief and we would
4	respond to it, since it's South Carolina that's trying
5	to describe what's within the scope of their
6	complaint.
7	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: That would be my
8	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick. We
9	disagree with that. We think the complaint speaks for
10	itself and North Carolina is making arguments about
11	what they think is in the scope of the complaint.
12	I mean, we're happy to do simultaneous briefing in the
13	interest of expedition with short replies. But this
14	is North Carolina's issue. They're the moving party
15	here.
16	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Well, they're not the
17	moving party. They raised the question, which I think
18	is a legitimate question. So I think, in some sense,
19	one could argue that the burden's on, I think you
20	could make argument on both sides, frankly, as to who
21	ought to go forward.
22	But thinking about it for a minute, I don't
23	see why it couldn't be done in simultaneous briefing.
24	Because it is, as you said, the pleading somewhat
25	speaks for itself and really it's a question of

ſ

1	gathering up what the arguments are from the pleading.
2	So I don't see why that couldn't be done
3	simultaneously with each side having the ability to
4	reply to the other side's submission.
5	So, if that's what the party would prefer,
6	I'd be happy with that structure. It doesn't lend
7	itself in any obvious way to a, a three-part
8	structure. Opening opposition reply structure.
9	MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning. We
10	would be more than glad to comply with whatever
11	briefing schedule most assists the Special Master.
12	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah, okay. Why don't
13	we do that? Why don't we do the simultaneous
14	briefing. That's also a very efficient way to
15	proceed, more efficient. Then we have two weeks from
16	today to get to the hearing. And we could have the
17	simultaneous reply I mean, opening briefs, would we
18	be able to do that by next Wednesday? And then have
19	the simultaneous reply briefs on Friday? That would
20	give a week before the hearing. So that would be the
21	19th of March for the opening briefs or the 21st. If
22	that's too tight on the replies, we could do the 18th.
23	That's kind of tight on the opening brief, though.
24	Why don't we say the 19th and the 21st. But if that's
25	a hardship for anyone, we could kick it over until the

1	24th.
2	MR. BROWNING: This is for North Carolina.
3	The 21st, our office is closed.
4	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Oh, it's Good Friday,
5	of course. Yeah. Let's do the 24th. Well, that's
6	Easter weekend, so that doesn't help very much either.
7	But
8	MR. FREDERICK: For South Carolina, we're
9	comfortable with either of the schedules.
10	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Unfortunately, we're
11	constrained by the 28th. So can we make it the 24th,
12	the 19th and the 24th?
13	MR. FREDERICK: Certainly.
14	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: It should be a pretty
15	simple issue, I would think.
16	DEPOSITION OFFICER: Please state your name
17	before you speak.
18	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: That would be helpful.
19	MR. FREDERICK: That was David Frederick
20	saying certainly that's a fine schedule for us.
21	DEPOSITION OFFICER: Thank you.
22	MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning. If
23	that's what the Special Master needs, we certainly
24	would be able to do that. My preference would be
25	rather than the 19th, the 20th, just based on some

03/14/08

_	
1	oral arguments that are scheduled the first part of
2	next week. So if we could do the 20th and 24th?
3	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Would that give
4	sufficient time for the replies?
5	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick.
6	We'll be happy to do that briefing schedule.
7	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. So we will say
8	3/20 for opening briefs on the scope of the pleadings.
9	3/24 for replies on that issue. Okay.
10	MR. FREDERICK: How long would you like for
11	those briefs to be?
12	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I was going to say
13	they really could be any length. I was thinking about
14	that, too. I mean, I imagine people aren't going to
15	go overboard. I don't mind reading, you know, it's a
16	simple issue, so I don't imagine it would lend itself
17	to any great length. So I'm not going to set a page
18	limit.
19	And also, I want this to be in a format that
20	lends itself to being in a record. But letter briefs
21	are probably fine, if you want to do a regular format
22	brief. You obviously don't have to do you know,
23	you know the rules don't require anything printed or
24	anything, you know, fancy. But the letter briefs you
25	did would be a fine format, or probably slightly

03/14/08

preferably just because it's going to be part of the record, a regular, you know, brief on regular paper would be good. It's also more readable to have it double-spaced.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

It does raise the question whether, issue two, North Carolina's Issue 2 seems to me at least to be, to be part of Issue 1. I mean, it's part of --I mean, really it's Issues 1, 2, 3. Probably, it doesn't strike me that 4 is necessarily part of this issue. But 1, 2, and 3 seem to me to be part of what we would be talking about. Do people agree with that?

MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning for North Carolina. Yes, we would agree with that.

SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. So does South Carolina disagree with that, Mr. Frederick?

MR. FREDERICK: No, we will brief this however you want us to brief it.

SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. Why don't we do 1, 2, and 3? If anybody wants to say anything about Issue 4, that's fine. But that doesn't strike me so much as an issue that's necessarily a pleading-driven question. Okay. Just look at the agenda here. I think that's everything for that issue.

The next issue raised by the letter report is the phasing of the case, which conceptually makes

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

03/14/08

1	accepts to me. Again, the first phase would be
2	dependent on the resolution of this pleading issue.
3	But the idea of phasing in terms of entitlement or the
4	burden of going forward or the burden of proceeding
5	followed by a phase on the other issues would make
6	sense to me.
7	Is there a middle phase? Is there a middle
8	phase that would be?
9	MR. GULICK: Your Honor, this is Jim Gulick
10	for North Carolina. I think there potentially may be
11	a middle phase, which is our and this is just our
12	view of this, is that first South Carolina would have
13	to prove by clear and convincing evidence that
1 4	North Carolina by its transfers of water, or its
15	consumption of water, as the case may be, is causing,
16	is causing is actually causing or imminently
17	threatening to cause serious, harm of serious
18	magnitude in South Carolina.
19	If South Carolina can meet that showing,
20	there may be an intermediate showing, and this may be
21	guided by somewhat to some extent by the scope of
22	South Carolina's claims, which would be that if
23	South Carolina meets that burden, North Carolina can,
24	if North Carolina can show that the benefits of those
25	particular transfers potentially outweigh the harm in

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

South Carolina, then it may be grounds for dismissal of the action.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And a third, of course, would be that if it gets past both of those, then, of course, the Court would have to undertake to hear all of the evidence necessary to do an apportionment of the river.

SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Right. That's somewhat what struck me, in reading the reports, that the first phase might be devoted to a burden of going forward. That there might then be a consideration of the merits, the ultimate merits of whether there needs to be a remedy under the applicable test. And then third, what the remedy would be. You could have a phase devoted to the first two parts of that.

In other words, it may be overlapping sufficiently on what you described as the second phase. That that might be all one phase. It may be the same issue.

MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick, South Carolina. I think that the suggestion of a potential middle phase is actually wrapped up in how much water would be deemed to be the equitable apportionment. That's a remedy question. And those considerations of benefit really tie into how much water each state should be allocated. And that's ſ

03/14/08

1	a remedy phase question, not a threshold question of
2	whether South Carolina's entitled to an equitable
3	apportionment.
4	The cases that we're familiar with don't
5	divide up these cases into three phases. They look at
6	has the plaintiff shown the harm? And if so, what
7	equitable apportionment is necessary in light of
8	looking at the benefits of consumptive uses on both
9	sides?
10	MR. GULICK: There's some disagreement there.
11	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah, that sounds like
12	a point of disagreement that we may have to resolve.
13	There's a big difference in that, at a high level
14	anyway. One option would be, South Carolina's
15	proposal would be that essentially South Carolina is
16	the only party that presents evidence in the first
17	phase of any import that North Carolina would be just
18	rebutting South Carolina's showing.
19	Under the other scenario, you would have both
20	sides presenting evidence on the issue of what you
21	might call, for lack of a better word, liability.
22	Probably not the right word. But entitlement. And
23	then you would proceed to the remedial phase, so
24	I don't know the correct answer to that right
25	now, but it does seem to me to be an issue that we

03/14/08

need to resolve. Maybe you all can work it out as 1 2 part of the case management discussions. If not, certainly that's a little mini issue that could be 3 4 keyed up for resolution, if necessary. But at the moment, skipping ahead to item 3, 5 6 since we are sort of touching on that anyway. Is this 7 an issue, this phasing and what the definition of the 8 phases would be, something that would be discussed as 9 part of the case management discussions and then we'll 10 come back if there's a disagreement? 11 MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick for 12 South Carolina. First, we drafted a case management 13 plan that we sent to North Carolina. We did that yesterday afternoon, but we've not had a chance yet to 14 15 meet and confer with North Carolina to discuss it. The draft that we sent did not address substantive 16 issues like this in the litigation but really was 17 18 geared more toward procedural matters. 19 I would suggest if the Special Master 20 approves this idea that we confer with North Carolina, 21 and we look at the case management plan from the 22 perspective of how we might address this additional 23 substantive issue that North Carolina has raised on 24 the call and how it would dovetail with the case 25 management plan.

I

03/14/08

1	The draft, as we sent it, envisioned a
2	two-phase litigation. And the first phase would
3	proceed under the general outline of the case
4	management plan as drafted with the idea being that a,
5	you know, any necessary amendments to that plan would
6	be made at the point where we would launch into what
7	South Carolina envisions to be the remedy phase. But
8	I think that it would be helpful to have a meet and
9	confer with North Carolina on that issue.
10	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: To define the phases
11	as part of the case management plan?
12	MR. FREDERICK: That's correct.
13	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah, I think that's a
14	good idea. I do. So you drafted something, I gather
15	from your writing that you did that off of an earlier
16	case management plan in a different case?
17	MR. FREDERICK: That's right. When we met
18	and conferred with North Carolina, they suggested that
19	we look at a case management plan from a case in which
20	North Carolina had been involved. We also looked at
21	other case management plans in other original cases.
22	And we drafted one that was an amalgam of what
23	appeared to be best practices in various original
24	cases.
25	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. That makes

03/14/08

a lot of sense. That's kind of what I did, too. I looked at one, at least. I looked at one from another case that was on a website. Ralph Lancaster had one that I thought was very good, but I assume you looked at that one as well. That was in, I think, a case that's still pending. But that's good. I mean, I think there's a lot of good prototypes out there, so....

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

MR. FREDERICK: We did -- this is David Frederick. We did look at the one in New Jersey versus Delaware that Special Master Lancaster had issued.

SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. So what's your timing, you think, on meeting and conferring on the case management, and either reaching agreement or reaching specific points of disagreement on it?

MR. FREDERICK: Well, we're available whenever North Carolina would like. I would assume that we could have a meet and confer early next week if that's convenient for North Carolina counsel.

MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning. We will certainly discuss the issue with South Carolina as soon as possible. We have not had a chance to discuss the draft that South Carolina circulated yesterday evening. I've had a chance to skim through

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

2

3

23

24

25

it and identify several issues that we need to talk about internally. And we'll certainly meet with South Carolina and discuss with them as soon as possible. Again, 4 I've got several things on my plate the very first 5 part of next week. So it might be more towards the 6 7 latter part of the week. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. That's great. 8 And if issues are not agreed upon, I think we want to 9 have an efficient procedure like we're going to do 10 with this scope issue of tying those up, tying those 11 up and getting a decision on them, you know. 12 But just identify things you don't agree on. 13 And then isolate those into some sort of communication 14 that we can then transform into a resolution. And 15 everything else you can just move forward on. 16 Okay. At a minimum, we can have another 17 report at the hearing, but I assume it will be before 18 then that you can report back. That the parties can 19 report back. And obviously, if the outcome of the 20 intervention motions may -- I think what's sensible is 21 to go forward with what you're doing. If there are --22

> SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

if parties come into the case through the intervention

motions, which right now is just an open issue, we may

revise the case management plan as necessary to

1	accommodate those additional parties. But again,
2	that's not you know, that's something that I think
3	we don't want to wait on that, on the resolution of
4	that. I'd rather finalize something between the
5	parties and then if necessary reopen the discussion if
6	there's additional parties.
7	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Did someone just join?
8	MR. GOLDSTEIN: This is Tom Goldstein,
9	Special Master Myles. I just changed phones.
10	I apologize.
11	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I see. That's
12	all right.
13	Going back to Item 2, the intervention
14	motions were on the calendar for today's conference.
15	The order will come out on Monday. So we'll know at
16	that point whether the Charlotte, City of Charlotte's
17	motion would be referred. I expected it would, but
18	you never know. So we'll find that out on on
19	Monday. And we could just, I'll probably just make a
20	report or people can just check the court's website.
21	It's easy enough to find out.
22	The other thing is the issues, the
23	intervention motions all raise different issues. And
24	as the date for the hearing approaches, I may have a
25	couple of additional questions that I'd like to ask

2 Alous

03/14/08

_	
1	before the hearing or ask people to be prepared to
2	address at the hearing. I'm going to try to do that
3	next week, so that if people want to submit anything
4	in writing, they'd have the time to do that. So I
5	just give you a heads up on that.
6	I'll probably do that by way of a formal case
7	management order, so that the additional questions end
8	up being part of the record. It would be just
9	questions raised by the briefs.
10	Does anyone have anything on those? It's
11	really just Items 1 through 3. I don't have anything
12	more on those.
13	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick,
14	Special Master Myles. On the intervention motions, do
15	you contemplate taking them up in a particular order?
16	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: That's a very good
17	question. The answer is no. But I don't object to
18	doing so in a particular order if anybody has ideas.
19	I hadn't thought about the order. I could do them in
20	the order in which they were filed. That would be a
21	fair way of doing it.
22	MR. PHILLIPS: This is Carter Phillips from
23	Duke. That's fine. I don't even know precisely what
24	the order was in which they were filed.
25	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I don't know either.

MR. PHILLIPS: We'd be happy to do that. 1 SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I know that 2 Charlotte's was filed last, that's all I know. 3 MR. PHILLIPS: I remember that part as well. 4 SPECIAL MATER MYLES: I honestly don't have a 5 view on that. If it would help people to prepare, and 6 if I end up forming a view, I'll try to communicate 7 If it that as part of these questions that I ask. 8 would help people, just to be prepared. 9 Special Master Myles, this is Tom Goldstein. 10 One suggestion would be that there is one threshold 11 12 argument that South Carolina has raised in opposition to the motions to intervene. And that is simply the 13 permissibility in an equitable apportionment case of 14 really anyone intervening at all who's not a govern. 15 And it might well be that it would be helpful 16 to get argument on that question from one of the 17 lawyers for the intervenors if they can agree on that 18 or resolve that through argument. Just so you aren't 19 having to hear the same points over and over and over. 20 21 SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: That's a very good point. I actually did that in that case I had where 22 23 we had a case, an issue was resolved here in California by prop -- what we call Prop 64, it had to 24 do with the standing requirements for unfair 25

03/14/08

1	
1	competition claims. And the proposition elevated the
2	standing. And we had, I think, about 30 cases argued
3	at the same time by the conflicts judge in Alameda.
4	And he said, "Well, one person should argue the common
5	issue," because there was really one common issue.
6	And then it worked out very well. Because
7	obviously, he didn't want to hear, you know, 30
8	iterations of the same legal point.
9	So I don't I think that would be fine, if
10	you all want to agree on a spokesman for that, for the
11	common issue of, I guess it's really two issues. One,
12	whether intervention is permitted in equitable
13	apportionment cases. And two, if so, what are the
14	general criteria for intervention that would apply?
15	I suppose
16	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick,
17	Special Master Myles. May I suggest that the three
18	proposed intervenors speak first and make their case
19	for their intervention. And to the extent that there
20	is overlap in their presentations, that they work out
21	in advance how they want to do that.
22	And that I'll be representing South Carolina
23	at the hearing, and would propose to address the three
24	motions in one presentation rather than be like a Jack
25	In The Box popping up and down on each motion. I

think it would be more efficient to handle it that way 1 2 as there are overlapping legal issues. And then, you know, counsel for each of the 3 proposed intervenors can make their special arguments 4 as to why their proposed intervenor stands in special 5 category. But then they won't have to repeat the 6 arguments that might have been made by counsel just 7 before them. 8 SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: What are the 9 10 intervenors thinking about that? 11 MR. PHILLIPS: This is Carter Phillips for 12 Duke. That makes eminent sense to me, frankly.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: This is Tom Goldstein for Catawba River Water Supply. That makes perfect sense and that lets you not have to worry about how the would-be intervenors are going to resolve among themselves dealing with the common issues.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There will be little complications that I would think we can resolve through common sense about rebuttal and the like. But my hope is that this will all -- that seems a really sensible beginning framework.

SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah. I mean, I think everybody would have to have their own chance at rebuttal. And yeah, I think that could be worked out.

> SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

1 What about --MR. BANKS: This is Jim Banks for Charlotte. 2 3 We think that's a good plan as well. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: So what makes sense 4 for me is for you all to work out, if possible, the 5 order, if you can. And then otherwise, I'll just 6 decide what order. But actually, if you can decide 7 what order you want to go in and it's really -- that 8 would be your decision, the parties' decision, the 9 intervenors decision really on how they want to 10 present. Because they're the moving parties. So do 11 you want to talk about that and make a decision? 12 This is Carter Phillips. We MR. PHILLIPS: 13 14 can do that. We can coordinate that without any 15 problem. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Then if you do come up 16 with an order, just let me know, so then I can prepare 17 to go in that order, too. 18 MR. FREDERICK: And Mr. Phillips, I'd 19 appreciate the notification as well. 20 MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, I was going to share it 21 22 with everybody. 23 SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah. Okay. Anything else about intervention? We 24 have the same courtroom we did before. We'll have 25

03/14/08

a court reporter. This is kind of like setting up 1 2 shop across the country. But I think everything's in It's the Tan courtroom. 3 place. And I don't know, you know, my main goal is 4 to get through the intervention. If we can put the 5 other issue on, you know, I think we should prepare to 6 do that. But if it ends up not being possible, then 7 we can just deal with the phasing issue later. But 8 for tentatively we'll have it on calendar for that day. 9 10 I think we also have a case management conference on that day. But given this conference, 11 12 I'm not sure how much is going to be needed. I mean, we could do a status update, but I don't think we'll 13 need much more than that. Depending on where the case 14 15 management plan is. 16 Anything further on intervention? Okay. MR. FREDERICK: Actually, this is David 17 I have a question whether North Carolina 18 Frederick. 19 is going to participate in the argument. MR. BROWNING: We do not intend to address 20 anything at the -- with respect to the intervention 21 issues unless the Special Master would be benefited if 22 23 something arises and a question is posed for 24 North Carolina. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. There certainly 25

03/14/08

may be factual questions posed, if nothing else, so 1 That's helpful. You'll be prepared to answer 2 okay. 3 questions, in other words. MR. BROWNING: Yes. 4 SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. Anything else 5 6 on that? 7 Then I have the next item is the website, which I am told by my latest report will be up and 8 running, again by the latest report, tomorrow. But 9 this was a report I got about a week ago. I'm trying 10 to get an update. But if this WebMaster report is 11 accurate, then we should be up and running very 12 shortly. I'm just going to see if there's -- here's 13 14 an additional update. Let me just see what it says. 15 They're reviewing the functional prototype 16 this afternoon. I don't know what most of this stuff means. But -- well, he doesn't give me a time update, 17 18 but it sounds like they're pretty far along. So it 19 sounds like they're going to still be on target to have it implemented over the weekend, and hopefully it 20 21 will be online next week. So I'll let you know. Special Master, this is Carter 22 MR. PHILLIPS: 23 Phillips. Will this be accessible on the Munger 24 Tolles, or is that --SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: That's what they're 25

planning on doing. Yeah, that's the plan. 1 2 MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: And it may be the only 3 way of doing it. I tried to get it kind of off site. 4 Because I don't think it really relates to Munger 5 Tolles, you know, in any direct way. But I know that 6 Ralph Lancaster has his on his law firm website and it 7 I just -- if I can get it to be sort of 8 works fine. a link to an offsite, that's what I asked them to do. 9 But it may well end up being under Munger Tolles, 10 because that's the only way they could functionally do 11 12 it. But it should be separately styled. I mean, 13 14 it won't -- it won't be, it won't have the appearance of being a Munger Tolles document, I don't think. You 15 16 may just have to go through the website to get there. MR. PHILLIPS: Right. That's what I assumed, 17 18 but I just wanted to clarify it. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah. It will be very 19 helpful. I find the website model very helpful to 20 21 just be able to click on the document, get a pdf of every document in the case. So we're -- what I -- the 22 23 instructions were to download everything that had been previously filed in the case. And then on an ongoing 24 basis, including the transcripts, those will all be 25

l

03/14/08

1	downloaded as they come in, including things like the
2	letter brief. I just think it's important to have all
3	of that stuff as part of the record. The reports that
4	you all did these past few days. So I'll issue a
5	status on that as soon as we have it up and running.
6	And finally, the service list. I apologize
7	for any errors in the email transmissions. I think
8	there was a failure to communicate Mr. Frederick's
9	email service list, so we did err in one of our
10	communications. But I'm going to have Ms. Nichols
11	circulate to counsel what is now the current version
12	of the service list, which should also reflect the
13	current version of the email service list. So that
14	everybody can let me know if there's any additional
15	issues or changes to it. We should do that probably
16	today.
17	And that is all I have.
18	MR. FREDERICK: Special Master Myles, may
19	I ask kind of a mundane housekeeping question in
20	relation to the briefs that you would like us to file
21	next week? Given that they will be linked for
22	presumably by title on the website, what would you
23	like us to call these briefs?
24	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: That's a good
25	question. It's not a motion.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FREDERICK: May I propose that we simply do this as a brief in response to a case management order, I guess whatever the latest one was, or one that you might issue today just directing the parties to brief by a certain date? And that we simply call these briefs in response to case management order 7 number whatever? SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Yeah, I think that makes sense. What we might do is I will issue a case management order directing the filing of the briefs per the schedule we agreed on today. They could be styled what you just said brief in response to case 13 management order number 4, or whatever it is, regarding scope. Regarding scope of pleadings. Or something like that. So then at least we can identify 16 what the subject matter is. MR. FREDERICK: Thank you. SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: I think that makes sense. Okay. Anything else? We should set another call like this. I don't think -- do we have one set? I think we had tried to do it roughly on the 6th of each month, and we moved this one to the 14th. Looking ahead. We have the conference on the 28th. We could shift it to the end of the month. I'm not

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

1	sure we need a conference mid month in April.
2	MR. FREDERICK: Special Master Myles, may
3	I ask whether the whether Special Master envisions
4	having the proposed intervenors on all of these calls,
5	or will there be a streamlining of that once the
6	intervention motions are ruled upon? Because I
7	presume, based on conversations with proposed
8	intervenor counsel, that they will be interested in
9	maintaining some interest as amici. But I don't think
10	on behalf of South Carolina that it would necessarily
11	be appropriate just for amici to be participating in
12	these case management calls.
13	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Well, it seems to me
14	that issue should await resolution of the intervention
15	motions. As long as the intervention motions are
16	pending, it seems to me that issues regarding those
17	motions are likely to arise in these calls. And
18	therefore, the calls should be opened to all parties
19	or punitive parties.
20	If if the resolution of the intervention
21	motions is against intervention, then I suppose we can
22	deal with that when it arises. And it may well be
23	that there may be calls where if those same parties
24	wish to be amici that amici would not be invited to
25	join the calls.

03/14/08

1 But I think that's sort of off into the 2 future. I think so long as there are intervention motions pending, I would think all parties or punitive 3 4 parties would be on the call. If they wish to be. 5 Obviously, nobody, I wouldn't think those 6 parties need to be on the call unless they have, 7 unless there's something that will affect them. Ι 8 think the parties need to be on the call. So I guess 9 I should divide the world into parties and nonparties 10 for that reason. I don't think there's any mandate 11 that intervenors appear on all of these calls. But 12 while the intervention motions are pending, they 13 certainly are welcome to. 14 So back to the issue of the next call. Shall 15 we say, does the Friday work well for people? This 16 works reasonably well for me. Friday mornings. We 17 could do Friday the 25th, which is about one month

18 after the hearing we're having.

19MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning.20Generally, Fridays work well for North Carolina in21terms of scheduling. The April 25th is a conflict for22both myself and Mr. Gulick. So if it were your23pleasure to set the conference for the 25th, someone24else from our office will attend the conference call.25SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: The 24th would also be

1	
	fine, if that would work for people.
2	MR. BROWNING: This is Chris Browning again.
3	That works for North Carolina.
4	MR. FREDERICK: This is David Frederick. And
5	that's fine for South Carolina as well.
6	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. Why don't we
7	set 4/24 10:00 a.m. Pacific time, 1:00 p.m. Eastern
8	for the next conference call.
9	I do think that we should at least
10	tentatively plan to do the same thing we did today
11	with having status reports sent a couple days in
12	advance of that. So like on the 22nd. I found the
13	status conference letters to be very helpful. I also
14	think it gears people up to resolve things that are
15	unresolved as of that moment.
16	Even if we may have things further along on
17	the case management plan, and there's nothing to
18	report on the 24th, I think of those reports even if
19	they're brief. So let's plan on that, too. So can
20	people get me something by April 22nd?
21	MR. BROWNING: North Carolina will have you
22	something by that date.
23	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay.
24	MR. FREDERICK: As will South Carolina.
25	SPECIAL MASTER MYLES: Okay. Good enough.

1	I think that's all that I have for today. If								
2	anybody else has anything, now is the time to raise								
3	it. And I'll give you a report on the various								
4	outstanding items including the website.								
5	Thank you, Counsel.								
6	MR. BROWNING: Thank you.								
7	MR. FREDERICK: Thank you.								
8	MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.								
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16									
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									

1 I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand 2 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: 3 That the foregoing proceedings were taken 4 before me at the time and place herein set forth; that 5 any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to 6 testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the 7 proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand 8 which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; 9 that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the 10 testimony given. 11 Further, that if the foregoing pertains to 12 the original transcript of a deposition in a Federal 13 Case, before completion of the proceedings, review of 14 the transcript [] was [] was not requested. 15 I further certify I am neither financially 16 interested in the action nor a relative or employee 17 of any attorney or party to this action. 18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date 19 subscribed my name. 20 Dated: APR - 1 2008 21 22 23 DANA M. FREED 24 CSR No. 10602 25

INDEX

03/14/08

Α	25:13	best 19:23	16:20 17:15,17	CHRISTOPHER 3:1
ability 11:3	appreciate 27:20	better 17:21	18:12,13,15,20,23	4:11
able 11:18 12:24	approaches 22:24	big 17:13	19:7,9,18,20 20:18	circulate 31:11
30:21	appropriate 33:11	Bob 5:12 6:4	20:20,22,24 21:3	circulated 20:24
accepts 15:1	approves 18:20	bounded 7:7,16,18	24:12 25:22 28:18	City 4:8 6:10,12
•	April 33:1 34:21	Box 3:5 25:25	28:24 33:10 34:20	22:16
accessible 29:23	35:20	Boyd 4:10 6:12	35:3,5,21,24	claims 15:22 25:1
accommodate 22:1	argue 10:19 25:4	brief 7:10 8:5 10:3	CAROLINAS 3:19	clarify 30:18
accurate 29:12	argued 8:8 9:4 25:2	11:23 13:22 14:2	Carolina's 10:14	clear 15:13
action 16:2 37:17,18	argument 10:20	14:16,17 31:2 32:2		click 30:21
additional 18:22	24:12,17,19 28:19	1 /	14:6 15:22 17:2,14	1
22:1,6,25 23:7	1 ' '	32:5,12 35:19	17:18	closed 12:3
29:14 31:14	arguments 7:10	briefed 8:8	Carter 3:21 6:8	Columbia 3:6
address 18:16,22	10:10 11:1 13:1	briefing 10:12,23	23:22 26:11 27:13	come 18:10 21:23
23:2 25:23 28:20	26:4,7	11:11,14 13:6	29:22	22:15 27:16 31:1
addressed 7:3	arises 28:23 33:22	briefs 7:11,11,16	case 8:1,1 14:25	comfortable 12:9
addressing 7:12	asked 30:9	9:22 11:17,19,21	15:15 18:2,9,12,21	common 25:4,5,11
advance 25:21 35:12	Assembly 3:6	13:8,11,20,24 23:9	18:24 19:3,11,16	26:17,19
affect 7:25 34:7	ASSISTANT 3:4	31:20,23 32:6,10	19:16,19,19,21	communicate 24:7
afternoon 18:14	assists 11:11	Brown 5:14,14	20:3,6,15 21:23,25	31:8
29:16	assume 20:4,18	Browning 3:15 5:15	23:6 24:14,22,23	communication
agenda 6:21 7:1	21:18	10:1,1 11:9,9 12:2	25:18 28:10,14	21:14
14:22	assumed 30:17	12:22,22 14:12,12	30:22,24 32:2,6,9	communications
ago 29:10	assuming 10:2	20:21,21 28:20	32:12 33:12 35:17	31:10
agrcook@ag.stat	attend 34:24	29:4 34:19,19 35:2	37:14	competition 25:1
3:7	attorney 3:4,21 4:5	35:2,21 36:6	cases 17:4,5 19:21	complaint 7:7,13 9
agree 14:11,13 21:13	37:18	Building 4:5	19:24 25:2,13	9:8 10:6,9,11
24:18 25:10	Attorneys 3:10,16	burden 15:4,4,23	Catawba 4:2 6:17	completion 37:14
agreed 21:9 32:11	4:12	16:9	26:14	complications 26:1
agreement 20:15	Attorney's 6:12	burden's 10:19	catch 5:22	comply 11:10
ahead 18:5 32:24	AUSTIN 3:20	B-a-r-t-o-l-o-m-u	category 26:6	conceptually 14:25
AKIN 4:4	available 20:17	6:14	cause 15:17	concern 9:19
Alameda 25:3	Avenue 4:6	B-e-r-n-s-t-e-i-n	causing 15:15,16,16	conduct 5:5
allocated 16:25	await 33:14	5:17	cbrowning@ncdo	confer 18:15,20 19:
amalgam 19:22	A-n-g-s-t-r-e-i-c-h	B-o-y-d 6:12	3:18	20:19
-	6:1		certain 32:5	conference 1:14
amendments 19:5	a.m 2:15,16 5:2,2	С	certainly 12:13,20	2:14 7:1 22:14
amici 33:9,11,24,24	35:7	C 3:9 4:4	12:23 18:3 20:22	28:11,11 32:24
amount 9:15	55.7	calendar 22:14 28:9	21:3 28:25 34:13	
Angstreich 3:9 5:10	B	California 24:24	Certified 2:17 37:1	33:1 34:23,24 35:1 35:13
6:1	back 5:19 18:10	37:2		
answer 17:24 23:17	21:19,20 22:13	call 5:5,6 6:20 17:21	certify 37:3,16	conferred 19:18
29:2	34:14	18:24 24:24 31:23	chance 18:14 20:23	conferring 20:14
anybody 6:24 14:19	Banks 4:10 6:10,10	1	20:25 26:24	conflict 34:21
23:18 36:2	27:2,2	32:5,21 34:4,6,8,14 34:24 35:8	changed 22:9	conflicts 25:3
anyway 17:14 18:6	Bartolomucci 4:11		changes 31:15	consideration 16:1
apologize 22:10 31:6		calls 33:4,12,17,18	Charlotte 4:8 6:11	considerations
appear 34:11	6:14	33:23,25 34:11	6:11,12,15 22:16	16:24
appearance 30:14	based 12:25 33:7	Cantey 3:5 5:13 6:5	27:2	constrained 12:11
APPEARANCES 3:1	basis 30:25	Carolina 1:4,7 2:4,7	Charlotte's 22:16	consumption 15:15
4:1	beginning 2:15	3:3,6,13,14,17 5:7	24:3	consumptive 17:8
appeared 19:23	26:21	5:7,10,13,15,21 7:4	check 22:20	contemplate 23:15
applicable 16:12	behalf 33:10	7:5,6 8:7 9:2,12,12	Childs 3:5 5:13 6:5	Continued 4:1
apply 25:14	benefit 16:24	9:13 10:3,4,10 12:2	Chris 5:14,15 6:13	convenient 20:20
apportionment 16:6	benefited 28:22	12:8 14:13,15	10:1 11:9 12:22	conversations 33:7
	ham a 5 ha 15, 34 17,0	1 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 4 1 - 1 - 1		
16:23 17:3,7 24:14	benefits 15:24 17:8	15:10,12,14,18,19	14:12 20:21 34:19	convincing 15:13

03/14/08

	1	1	1	1
6:4	deposition 12:16,21	either 12:6,9 20:15	firm 6:15 30:7	getting 21:12
coordinate 27:14	37:13	23:25	first 5:18 6:25 13:1	give 11:20 13:3 23:5
correct 7:16 17:24	DEPUTY 3:4	elevated 25:1	15:1,12 16:9,14	29:17 36:3
19:12	describe 10:5	email 31:7,9,13	17:16 18:12 19:2	given 28:11 31:21
correctly 7:5	described 16:16	eminent 26:12	21:5 25:18	37:11
counsel 20:20 26:3,7	determinative 9:17	employee 37:18	flows 9:11	glad 11:10
31:11 33:8 36:5	devoted 16:9,14	ends 28:7	followed 15:5	go 5:19 6:7,21 10:21
country 28:2	dfrederick@khht	Energy 3:19 6:9	foregoing 37:4,6,10	13:15 21:22 27:8
couple 22:25 35:11	3:12	entitled 17:2	37:12	27:18 30:16
course 7:15 12:5	dictate 7:14	entitlement 15:3	form 7:11	goal 28:4
16:3,4	difference 17:13	17:22	formal 23:6	goes 8:4
court 5:20 16:4 28:1	different 19:16	envisioned 19:1	format 13:19,21,25	going 5:5 7:25 13:12
courtroom 27:25	22:23	envisions 19:7 33:3	forming 24:7	13:14,17 14:1 15:4
28:3	direct 30:6	equitable 16:22 17:2	forth 37:5	16:9 21:10 22:13
court's 22:20	directing 32:4,10	17:7 24:14 25:12	forward 10:21 15:4	23:2 26:16 27:21
cphillips@sidley.c	direction 37:9	err 31:9	16:10 21:16,22	28:12,19 29:13,19
3:23	disagree 9:18 10:9	errors 31:7	found 35:12	31:10
criteria 25:14	14:15	essentially 17:15	framed 7:5,6	Goldstein 4:4 6:16
CSR 1:22 37:25	disagreement 17:10	EVANS 3:8	framework 26:22	6:16 9:6,7 22:8,8
current 31:11,13	17:12 18:10 20:16	evening 20:25	frankly 10:20 26:12	24:10 26:13,13
C-a-n-t-e-y 6:5	disagrees 8:16	everybody 6:19	Frederick 3:9 5:9,9	good 7:2 12:4 14:3
C-h-i-l-d-s 6:5	discuss 6:21 18:15	26:24 27:22 31:14	5:22,24,25 8:6,6,13	19:14 20:4,6,7
C-o-o-k 6:4	20:22,24 21:4	everybody's 5:6	9:2 10:8,8 12:8,13	23:16 24:21 27:3
	discussed 8:18 18:8	everything's 28:2	12:19,19 13:5,5,10	31:24 35:25
D	discussion 8:22 22:5	evidence 15:13 16:5	14:15,16 16:19,19	govern 24:15
D 3:4	discussions 18:2,9	17:16,20	18:11,11 19:12,17	great 13:17 21:8
DANA 1:21 2:17	dismissal 16:1	exchange 7:10	20:9,10,17 23:13	grounds 16:1
37:24	divide 17:5 34:9	excuse 5:14	23:13 25:16,16	guess 25:11 32:3
date 22:24 32:5	document 30:15,21	expected 22:17	27:19 28:17,18	34:8
35:22 37:19	30:22	expedition 10:13	31:18 32:1,17 33:2	guided 15:21
Dated 37:22	doing 8:23 21:22	expeditiously 8:15	35:4,4,24 36:7	Gulick 3:16 5:16
David 3:9,10 5:9,11	23:18,21 30:1,4	extent 15:21 25:19	Frederick's 31:8	15:9,9 17:10 34:22
5:24 6:1 8:6 10:8	double-spaced 14:4	extremely 6:23	FREED 1:21 2:17	GUMP 4:4
12:19 13:5 16:19	dovetail 18:24		37:24	G-u-l-i-c-k 5:16
18:11 20:9 23:13	download 30:23	F	Friday 1:16 2:16 5:1	
25:16 28:17 35:4	downloaded 31:1	factual 29:1	11:19 12:4 34:15	Η
day 8:21,22 28:9,11	draft 18:16 19:1	failure 31:8	34:16,17	H 4:11
days 31:4 35:11	20:24	fair 9:14 23:21	Fridays 34:20	Hampshire 4:6
deal 28:8 33:22	drafted 18:12 19:4	familiar 17:4	functional 29:15	handle 26:1
dealing 26:17	19:14,22	fancy 13:24	functionally 30:11	HANSEN 3:8
decide 27:7,7	Duke 3:19 6:9 23:23	far 29:18	further 9:21 28:16	happen 9:1
decision 21:12 27:9	26:12	Federal 37:13	35:16 37:12,16	happy 10:12 11:6
27:9,10,12	duly 37:7	FELD 4:4	future 34:2	13:6 24:1
deemed 16:22	D.C 3:11,22 4:6,13	FIGEL 3:8	F-r-e-d-e-r-i-c-k	hardship 11:25
Defendant 1:8	Did 5.11,22 1.0,15	file 10:3 31:20	5:25	harm 15:17,25 17:6
Defendants 2:8	E	filed 23:20,24 24:3	5,23	Hartson 4:9 6:15
define 19:10	earlier 19:15	30:24	G	HAUER 4:4
definition 18:7	early 20:19	filing 32:10	G 3:15,21	Hauser 5:17
Delaware 20:11	Easter 12:6	finalize 22:4	gather 19:14	heads 23:5
delay 9:20	Eastern 35:7	finally 31:6	gathering 11:1	hear 16:5 24:20 25:7
DEPARTMENT 3:14	easy 22:21	financially 37:17	geared 18:18	hearing 7:24 8:9,18
dependent 15:2	Edenton 3:17	find 22:18,21 30:20	gears 35:14	8:20,22 9:20,21,23
depending 9:10	efficiencies 9:3	fine 12:20 13:21,25	general 3:4 19:3	11:16,20 21:18
28:14	efficient 11:14,15	14:20 23:23 25:9	25:14	22:24 23:1,2 25:23
LU111	ennerent 11,17,17	17120 CJ1CJ CJ1J	2J.17	22.27 23.1,2 23.23
depends 9:24	21:10 26:1	30:8 35:1,5	Generally 34:20	34:18

Page 2

03/14/08

help 5:20 12:6 24:6,9	invited 33:24	L	March 1:16 2:16 5:1	move 6:25 9:20
helpful 6:23 9:17	involved 19:20	lack 17:21	8:9 11:21	21:16
12:18 19:8 24:16	isolate 21:14	Lancaster 20:3,11	Master 1:15 2:15 5:4	moved 32:23
29:2 30:20,20	issue 7:14,22,24,25	30:7	5:5,19 6:3,6,18 8:7	moving 10:14,17
35:13	8:5,17,21 9:23	latest 29:8,9 32:3	8:11,14 9:5,6,18	27:11
high 17:13	10:14 12:15 13:9	launch 19:6	10:7,16 11:11,12	mundane 31:19
Hogan 4:9 6:15	13:16 14:5,6,7,10	law 3:10,16,21 4:5	12:4,10,14,18,23	Munger 29:23 30:5
honestly 24:5	14:20,21,23,24	4:12 6:15 30:7	13:3,7,12 14:14,18	30:10,15
Honor 15:9	15:2 16:18 17:20	lawyers 24:18	16:7 17:11 18:19	Myles 1:15 2:15 5:4
hope 26:20	17:25 18:3,7,23	legal 25:8 26:2	19:10,13,25 20:11	5:5,19 6:3,6,18 8:7
hopefully 29:20	19:9 20:22 21:11	legitimate 10:18	20:13 21:8 22:7,9	8:11,14 9:5,6,18
housekeeping 31:19	21:24 24:23 25:5,5	lend 11:6 13:16	22:11 23:14,16,25	10:7,16 11:12 12:4
HUBER 3:8	25:11 28:6,8 31:4	lends 13:20	24:2,10,21 25:17	12:10,14,18 13:3,7
H-a-u-s-e-r 5:18	32:4,9 33:14 34:14	length 13:13,17	26:9,23 27:4,16,23	13:12 14:14,18
	issued 20:12	letter 7:11 13:20,24	28:22,25 29:5,22	16:7 17:11 19:10
I	issues 6:21,24 7:17	14:24 31:2	29:25 30:3,19	19:13,25 20:13
i dea 15:3 18:20 19:4	8:18 14:8 15:5	letters 35:13	31:18,24 32:8,18	21:8 22:7,9,11
19:14	18:17 21:1,9 22:22	let's 12:5 35:19	33:2,3,13 34:25	23:14,16,25 24:2,5
ideas 23:18	22:23 25:11 26:2	level 17:13	35:6,23,25	24:10,21 25:17
identify 21:1,13	26:17 28:22 31:15	liability 17:21	MATER 24:5	26:9,23 27:4,16,23
32:15	33:16	light 17:7	matter 32:16	28:25 29:5,25 30:3
imagine 13:14,16	item 6:25 7:2 18:5	limit 13:18	matters 18:18	30:19 31:18,24
imminently 15:16	22:13 29:7	limited 9:11,13	mean 8:3 10:12	32:8,18 33:2,13
implemented 29:20	items 23:11 36:4	link 30:9	11:17 13:14 14:7,8	34:25 35:6,23,25
import 17:17	iterations 25:8	linked 31:21	20:6 26:23 28:12	M-a-r-c 5:16
important 31:2		list 31:6,9,12,13	30:13	
include 7:19	J	litigation 18:17 19:2	means 29:17	<u>N</u>
included 7:15	Jack 25:24	little 18:3 26:18	meet 15:19 18:15	name 5:18 12:16
including 6:22 8:1	JAMES 4:10	LLC 3:19	19:8 20:19 21:3	37:20
30:25 31:1 36:4	Jennie 5:17	LLP 3:20 4:4,9	meeting 20:14	names 5:21,22
incorrect 7:15	Jersey 20:10	load 8:19	meets 15:23	necessarily 8:24
inform 9:8	Jim 3:16 5:16 6:10	long 13:10 33:15	merits 16:11,11	14:9,21 33:10
instructions 30:23	15:9 27:2	34:2	met 19:17	necessary 7:23 16:6
intend 28:20	JOB 1:23	look 14:22 17:5	MICHAEL 4:10	17:7 18:4 19:5
interbasin 9:14	join 22:7 33:25	18:21 19:19 20:10	mid 33:1	21:25 22:5
interest 9:10 10:13	judge 25:3	looked 19:20 20:2,2	middle 15:7,7,11	need 18:1 21:1 28:1
33:9	JUSTICE 3:14	20:5	16:21	33:1 34:6,8
interested 33:8	J-e-n-n-i-e 5:18	looking 17:8 32:24	Mike 6:12	needed 28:12
37:17		lot 6:20 20:1,7	mind 13:15	needs 6:20 7:3 8:15
intermediate 15:20	K	100 0.20 20.1,7	mini 18:3	12:23 16:11
internally 21:2	K 3:22	М	minimum 21:17	neither 37:16
intervene 24:13	KELLOGG 3:8	M 1:21 2:17 3:11	minute 10:22	never 22:18
intervening 24:15	keyed 18:4	machine 37:8	model 30:20	New 4:6 20:10
intervenor 3:19 4:2	kick 11:25	magnitude 15:18	moment 18:5 35:15	Nichols 31:10
26:5 33:8	kind 11:23 20:1 28:1	main 9:19 28:4	Monday 22:15,19	nonparties 34:9
intervenors 5:8 6:7	30:4 31:19	maintaining 33:9	month 32:23,25 33:1	North 1:7 2:7 3:13
9:10,15,16 24:18	know 13:15,22,23,24	making 10:10	34:17	3:14,17 5:7,15 7:5
25:18 26:4,10,16	14:2 17:24 19:5	management 8:1	mornings 34:16	7:6 9:12,12 10:10
27:10 33:4 34:11	21:12 22:2,15,18	18:2,9,12,21,25	motion 22:17 25:25	10:14 12:2 14:6,13
intervention 8:9 9:9	23:23,25 24:2,3	19:4,11,16,19,21	31:25	15:10,14,23,24
21:21,23 22:13,23	25:7 26:3 27:17	20:15 21:25 23:7	motions 8:10,20	17:17 18:13,15,20
23:14 25:12,14,19	28:4,4,6 29:16,21	28:10,15 32:2,6,10	21:21,24 22:14,23	18:23 19:9,18,20
27:24 28:5,16,21	30:6,6 31:14	32:13 33:12 35:17	23:14 24:13 25:24	20:18,20 28:18,24
33:6,14,15,20,21	Kristin 1:15 2:15	mandate 34:10	33:6,15,15,17,21	34:20 35:3,21
34:2,12			34:3,12	notification 27:20
J		Marc 3:15 5:16	1 5	1

SARNOFF COURT REPORTERS AND LEGAL TECHNOLOGIES 877.955.3855

03	/	1	4	1	0	8
----	---	---	---	---	---	---

number 7:1,2 32:7	14:10 18:2,9 19:11	13:8 32:14	prototype 29:15	remember 24:4
32:13	21:6,7 23:8 24:4,8	pleading-driven	prototypes 20:7	reopen 22:5
N.W 3:11,22 4:6,12	31:3	14:21	prove 15:13	repeat 26:6
N.W J.11,22 7.0,12	participate 28:19	Please 12:16	punitive 33:19 34:3	replies 10:13 11:22
Ö	participating 33:11	pleasure 34:23	put 8:21 28:5	13:4,9
object 23:17	particular 15:25	point 17:12 19:6	P.L.L.C 3:8	reply 11:4,8,17,19
obvious 11:7	23:15,18	22:16 24:22 25:8	p.m 35:7	report 14:24 21:18
obviously 9:16 13:22	parties 6:22 8:4 9:24	points 20:16 24:20	P	21:19,20 22:20
21:20 25:7 34:5	21:19,23 22:1,5,6	popping 25:25	Q	29:8,9,10,11 35:18
office 3:5 5:10,16	27:9,11 32:4 33:18	posed 28:23 29:1	question 7:2,12 9:9	36:3
6:13 12:3 34:24	33:19,23 34:3,4,6,8	possible 7:8 20:23	10:17,18,25 14:5	Reported 1:21
OFFICER 12:16,21	34:9	21:4 27:5 28:7	14:22 16:23 17:1,1	reporter 2:17 5:20
offsite 30:9	parts 8:1 16:14	Post 3:5	23:17 24:17 28:18	28:1 37:2
Oh 12:4	party 10:14,17 11:5	potential 16:21	28:23 31:19,25	reports 6:22 7:1
okay 6:6,18,25 8:13	17:16 37:18	potentially 15:10,25	questions 22:25	16:8 31:3 35:11,18
11:12 13:7,9 14:14		practices 19:23	23:7,9 24:8 29:1,3	representing 25:22
	pdf 30:21 pending 20:6 33:16	precisely 23:23	quite 5:22	requested 37:15
14:18,22 19:25			quite 5.22	require 13:23
20:13 21:8,17 27:24 28:16,25	34:3,12 people 8:3 9:22	prefer 11:5 preferably 14:1	R	requirements 24:25
29:2,5 30:2 32:20		• •	raise 6:25 14:5 22:23	resolution 7:8,25
-	13:14 14:11 22:20	preference 12:24	36:2	15:2 18:4 21:15
35:6,23,25 once 33:5	23:1,3 24:6,9 34:15	prepare 24:6 27:17	raised 6:22 10:17	1
	35:1,14,20	28:6	14:24 18:23 23:9	22:3 33:14,20
ongoing 30:24	perfect 26:14	prepared 23:1 24:9	24:12	resolve 17:12 18:1
online 29:21	permissibility 24:14	29:2	Raleigh 3:17	24:19 26:16,19 35:14
open 21:24	permitted 25:12	present 27:11	Ralph 20:3 30:7	1
opened 33:18	person 25:4	presentation 25:24	reaching 20:15,16	resolved 7:19 8:15 24:23
opening 11:8,17,21	perspective 18:22	presentations 25:20	readable 14:3	
11:23 13:8	pertains 37:12	presenting 17:20	reading 13:15 16:8	respect 28:21
opposition 11:8	phase 15:1,5,7,8,11	presents 17:16	really 8:4,11,17	respond 10:4
24:12	16:9,14,17,17,21	presumably 31:22	10:25 13:13 14:8	response 32:2,6,12
option 17:14	17:1,17,23 19:2,7	presume 33:7	16:24 18:17 23:11	review 37:14
oral 13:1	phases 17:5 18:8	pretty 12:14 29:18	24:15 25:5,11	reviewing 29:15 revise 21:25
order 22:15 23:7,15	19:10	previously 30:24	26:21 27:8,10 30:5	
23:18,19,20,24	phasing 14:25 15:3	primarily 8:4	reason 34:10	right 7:3,19 16:7 17:22,24 19:17
27:6,7,8,17,18 32:3	18:7 28:8	printed 13:23	reasonably 34:16	21:24 22:12 30:17
32:6,10,13	Phillips 3:21 6:8,8	prior 8:9 37:6	rebuttal 26:20,25	river 4:2 6:17 16:6
original 19:21,23	23:22,22 24:1,4	probably 7:23 13:21	rebutting 17:18	26:14
37:13	26:11,11 27:13,13	13:25 14:8 17:22	record 13:20 14:2	1
ought 7:19 8:25	27:19,21 29:22,23	22:19 23:6 31:15	23:8 31:3 37:7,10	Robert 3:4 4:5
10:21	30:2,17 36:8	problem 8:23 27:15	referred 22:17	roll 5:5
outcome 21:20	phone 6:11	procedural 18:18	reflect 31:12	Room 3:6
outline 19:3	phones 22:9	procedure 21:10	regarding 32:14,14	roughly 32:22
outstanding 36:4	place 28:3 37:5	proceed 5:8 11:15	33:16	ruled 33:6
outweigh 15:25	plaintiff 1:5 2:5 17:6	17:23 19:3	regular 13:21 14:2,2	rules 13:23
overboard 13:15	plan 8:2 18:13,21,25	proceeding 15:4	Related 9:7	running 29:9,12 31:5
overlap 25:20	19:4,5,11,16,19	proceedings 37:4,6	relates 30:5	S
overlapping 16:15	21:25 27:3 28:15	37:8,14		
26:2	30:1 35:10,17,19	PROJECT 4:3	relation 31:20 relationship 8:17	S 4:5
Ρ	planning 30:1	prop 24:24,24	relative 37:17	Sarratt 3:10 5:11 6:1
	plans 19:21	proposal 17:15		saying 12:20
Pacific 35:7	plate 21:5	propose 25:23 32:1	relatively 9:22	says 29:14
page 13:17	plausibly 8:21	proposed 3:19 4:2	relief 7:4	scenario 17:19
paper 14:2	pleading 7:14 10:24	25:18 26:4,5 33:4,7	remedial 17:23	schedule 7:22,23
Parker 4:11 6:13 part 13:1 14:1,7,7,9	11:1 15:2	proposition 25:1 propriety 9:9	remedy 9:11 16:12 16:13,23 17:1 19:7	11:11 12:20 13:6 32:11
	pleadings 7:17,18,18			

03/14/08

	24.1		22, 2 25, 2 0 26, 4 40	Thom 5 - C:17
scheduled 13:1	34:1	submissions 7:22	22:2 25:2,9 26:1,19	Т-h-о-m-s-о-п 6:13
schedules 12:9	sought 7:4	9:25	26:23,25 27:3 28:2	U
scheduling 10:2	sounds 6:18 17:11	submit 23:3	28:6,10,13 30:5,15	Uh-huh 9:5
34:21	29:18,19	subscribed 37:20	31:2,7 32:8,18,21	ultimate 16:11
scope 7:4,13 9:3,8	South 1:4 2:4 3:3,6	substantive 18:16	32:22 33:9 34:1,2,3	undersigned 37:1
10:5,11 13:8 15:21	5:7,10,13,21 7:4	18:23	34:5,8,10 35:9,14	-
21:11 32:14,14	8:7 9:2,13 10:3,4	sufficient 13:4	35:18 36:1	undertake 16:5
Scott 3:9 5:10,25	12:8 14:15 15:12	sufficiently 16:16	thinking 10:22 13:13	unfair 24:25
second 16:16	15:18,19,22,23	suggest 18:19 25:17	26:10	Unfortunately 12:10
see 5:6 8:17 10:23	16:1,20 17:2,14,15	suggested 19:18	third 16:3,13	unresolved 35:15 update 28:13 29:11
11:2 22:11 29:13	17:18 18:12 19:7	suggestion 16:20	Thirteenth 4:12	29:14,17
29:14	20:22,24 21:3	24:11	THOMAS 4:4	uses 17:8
sense 7:9 10:18 15:6	24:12 25:22 33:10	Suite 3:11	Thomson 4:11 6:13	USES 17.0
20:1 26:12,14,19	35:5,24	Supply 4:2 6:17	thought 6:21 7:2,21	V
27:4 32:9,19	speak 12:17 25:18	26:14	8:8 20:4 23:19	various 19:23 36:3
sensible 21:21 26:21	speaks 10:9,25	suppose 9:21 25:15	threatening 15:17	version 31:11,13
sent 18:13,16 19:1	special 1:15 2:14 5:4	33:21	three 8:20 17:5	versus 20:11
35:11	5:4,19 6:3,6,18 8:7	sure 5:24 28:12 33:1	25:17,23	view 8:25 15:12 24:6
separately 30:13	8:11,14 9:5,6,18	sworn 37:7	three-part 11:7	24:7
serious 15:17,17	10:7,16 11:11,12	S-a-r-r-a-t-t 6:2	threshold 17:1 24:11	vs 1:6 2:6
service 31:6,9,12,13	12:4,10,14,18,23	T	tie 8:12 16:24	VS 1.0 2.0
set 7:21 13:17 32:20	13:3,7,12 14:14,18		tied 8:24	W
32:21 34:23 35:7	16:7 17:11 18:19	T 4:10	tight 11:22,23	wait 22:3
37:5	19:10,13,25 20:11	take 6:20	time 6:20 8:5 13:4	want 6:24 8:19 9:20
setting 28:1	20:13 21:8 22:7,9	taken 37:4	23:4 25:3 29:17	9:20 13:19,21
share 27:21	22:11 23:14,16,25	talk 21:1 27:12	35:7 36:2 37:5	14:17 21:9 22:3
shift 32:25	24:2,5,10,21 25:17	talking 14:11	timing 9:19 20:14	23:3 25:7,10,21
shop 28:2	26:4,5,9,23 27:4,16	Tan 28:3	title 31:22	27:8,10,12
short 10:13	27:23 28:22,25	target 29:19 teed 9:23	today 11:16 31:16	wanted 30:18
shorthand 2:17 37:1	29:5,22,25 30:3,19	telephonic 1:14 2:14	32:4,11 35:10 36:1	wants 14:19
37:8	31:18,24 32:8,18	7:23	today's 5:6 22:14 TODD 3:8	Washington 3:11,22
shortly 29:13	33:2,3,13 34:25	tell 9:14	told 29:8	4:6,13
show 15:24	35:6,23,25	tentatively 28:9	Tolles 29:24 30:6,10	water 4:2 6:17 15:14
showing 15:19,20	specific 20:16	35:10	30:15	15:15 16:22,25
17:18	spell 5:21	terms 8:3,4 15:3	Tom 6:16 22:8 24:10	26:14
shown 17:6	spokesman 25:10 stake 9:15,16	34:21	26:13	way 11:7,14 23:6,21
side 11:3		test 16:12	tomorrow 29:9	26:1 30:4,6,11
sides 10:20 17:9,20	standing 24:25 25:2 stands 26:5	testifying 37:7	touching 18:6	WebMaster 29:11
side's 11:4	state 12:16 16:25	testimony 37:11	transcribed 37:9	website 20:3 22:20
SIDLEY 3:20 simple 12:15 13:16	37:2	tgoldstein@aking	transcript 37:10,13	29:7 30:7,16,20
-	status 6:22 7:1	4:7	37:15	31:22 36:4
simply 7:12 24:13	28:13 31:5 35:11	Thank 6:3 12:21	transcripts 30:25	Wednesday 11:18
32:1,5 simultaneous 10:12	35:13	32:17 36:5,6,7,8	transfer 9:14	week 11:20 13:2
	Strauss 4:4,5	they'd 23:4	transfers 15:14,25	20:19 21:6,7 23:3
10:23 11:13,17,19		thing 22:22 35:10	transform 21:15	29:10,21 31:21
simultaneously 11:3	streamlining 33:5 Street 3:6,11,17,22	things 21:5,13 31:1	transmissions 31:7	weekend 12:6 29:20
site 30:4 skim 20:25	4:12	35:14,16	tried 30:4 32:22	weeks 11:15
skipping 18:5	strike 14:9,20	think 5:20,21 6:20	true 37:10	welcome 34:13
slightly 13:25	struck 16:8	7:5,7,9,13,25 8:3	try 23:2 24:7	West 3:17
somewhat 9:24	structure 11:6,8,8	8:14,15,23 9:21	trying 10:4 29:10	we'll 13:6 18:9 21:3
10:24 15:21 16:8	stuff 29:16 31:3	10:9,11,17,18,19	two 7:17 11:15 14:6	22:15,18 27:25
	styled 30:13 32:12	12:15 14:23 15:10	16:14 25:11,13	28:9,13
soon 7:8 9:22 20:23	subject 32:16	16:20 19:8,13 20:5	two-phase 19:2	we're 5:5 9:4 10:12
21:4 31:5 sort 18:6 21:14 30:8	submission 11:4	20:7,14 21:9,21	tying 21:11,11	12:8,10 17:4 20:17
			1	1 ' ' '

	1	 í	1
21:10 30:22 34:18	20005 3:22		
we've 18:14	20036 3:11 4:6		
WHEREOF 37:19	2008 1:16 2:16 5:1		
wish 33:24 34:4	202.326.7900 3:12		
WITNESS 37:19	202.637.5600 4:13		
witnesses 37:6	202.736.8270 3:23		
word 17:21,22	21st 11:21,24 12:3		
words 16:15 29:3	22nd 35:12,20		
work 18:1 25:20	24th 12:1,5,11,12		
27:5 34:15,20 35:1	13:2 34:25 35:18		
worked 25:6 26:25	25th 34:17,21,23		
works 30:8 34:16	27602 3:17		
35:3	28th 8:9 12:11 32:24		
world 34:9	29211-1549 3:6		
worry 26:15			
wouldn't 34:5	3		
would-be 9:10,16	3 14:8,10,19 18:5		
26:16	23:11		
wrapped 16:21	3/20 13:8		
writing 19:15 23:4	3/24 13:9		
·····	30 25:2,7		
<u>Y</u>			
yeah 11:12 12:5	4		
17:11 19:13 26:23	4 14:9,20 32:13		
26:25 27:21,23	4/24 35:7		
30:1,19 32:8	400 3:11		
yesterday 18:14			
20:25	5		
	519 3:6		
1	555 4:12		
1 7:1,2 14:7,8,10,19			
23:11	6		
1:00 35:7	6th 32:22		
10:00 35:7	64 24:24		
10:03 2:15 5:2	· ·		
10:50 2:16 5:2	· 8		
1000 3:6	803.734.3736 3:7		
10602 1:22 2:18	84418 1:23		
37:25			
114 3:17	9		
11549 3:5	919.716.6400 3:18		
1333 4:6			
138 1:6 2:6			
14 1:16 2:16 5:1			
14th 32:23			
1501 3:22			
1615 3:11			
18th 11:22			
19th 11:21,24 12:12			
12:25			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
2			
2 14:6,8,10,19 22:13			
20th 12:25 13:2			
20004 4:13			