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SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning, counsel.

MR. PRIMIS: Good morning.
MR. PERRY: Good morning, your Honor. Phil Perry for Florida.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Unfortunately, the case manager, Josh Dunlap, has a conflict and is not here. So you will have to be patient with me today because my brains are not here to keep me straight.

Mary Clifford is here and, of course, our extraordinary court reporter is here also.

Please enter your appearances starting with Florida.

MR. PERRY: Good morning, your Honor.
Phil Perry for Florida.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anyone else with Florida?

MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we have an assembled number in the conference room here, none of which are planning to speak, but Chris Kise, Os Fernandez, John Cooper, and Allen Winsor may be on.
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SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Winsor, are you on?

Apparently not.
All right. Georgia?
MR. PERRY: Mr. Lancaster, just a slight correction. It's Os Vazquez.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MS. GRANT: Your Honor, this is Britt Grant for Georgia. And I believe that Craig Primis is in Washington, D.C., on the line.

MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. Craig Primis from Kirkland \& Ellis. I have my colleague Andrew Pruitt on the line as well.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: United States?

MR. GRAY: Yes. Good morning, your Honor. This is Michael Gray for the United States.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Is there anyone else who hasn't been identified who is on the line?

All right, counsel. I understand what the issue is. Before we get started, just to make sure we're all on the same page, I'm going to recite what I remember from my THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
memory without Josh here to correct me. And if I'm incorrect in any respect, please interrupt me.

My memory is that the depositions are supposed to begin on June 1 of this year and end on June 15 -- I'm sorry, January 15 of 2016. According to CMP 5.3, there should be no more than three eight-hour days. And if I'm doing my arithmetic correctly, in theory that would mean that Georgia could take three times 20 or 60 , and Florida three times 44 or 132.

My memory is that Florida noticed -already noticed 27 depositions and another 17 are anticipated.

Has Georgia noticed any?
MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. Georgia has noticed 16 depositions including a 30(b)(6) deposition for the State of Florida.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Have any
depositions already been taken, Florida?
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, they begin
tomorrow.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: No. Tomorrow is the first THE REPORTING GROUP
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## one.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Do you -- let me ask you; do you intend to have the same attorney taking all the depositions or different attorneys?

Florida?
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we have at least five attorneys who are prepared to take depositions in this case and a number who are prepared to defend. And we could and are prepared to go forward with several simultaneously on any given day.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we will have multiple attorneys covering the many depositions that will be required, whether we have a limit of 20 or some higher number.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Okay. Let's proceed to the argument. Florida, do you want to state your position?

MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. Our position is that the Supreme Court has made clear that full and liberal factual development is permitted in original actions. And with your indulgence, your Honor, I would THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

6
like to start by reading a very short quote from the Texas Coastal Waters case where the Supreme Court said, quote, the Court, in original actions, passing as it does on controversies between sovereigns which involve issues of high public importance, has always been liberal in allowing full development of the facts.

Now, that's at 339 U.S. 707, 715. It cites both Kansas versus Colorado and Oklahoma V Texas for the same proposition. And, indeed, similar statements can be found both in other Supreme Court opinions and in Special Master reports. One from 1996 says almost the same thing, Special Master Verkuil in the New Jersey versus New York case, which I can read, too.

I will also note that we have gone back, your Honor, to look at the number of depositions taken in prior original actions. We think 40 to 45 depositions is well within the normal practice in original actions.

I can supply a couple of examples. In the Kansas versus Colorado case in 1995 -and there are several cases, Kansas versus THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Colorado; but this is in 1995 -- there was a

Compact dispute about groundwater pumping for irrigation in Colorado. In the liability phase of the case alone, the plaintiff Kansas took 42 depositions. And collectively between the parties throughout all phases of the case there were, it appears, more than 200 depositions taken.

In the 1941 case, New Jersey versus New York, higher salinities were alleged to cause impacts on oysters in Delaware Bay that resulted from reduced river flows similar to some in this case. 123 witnesses were called at trial in that case.

There are other examples. For example, the Kansas versus Colorado case in 1907, Arizona versus California case in 1963 where the parties called more than 300 trial witnesses.

We found only one case, your Honor, in searching through the records that are available where there was any kind of deposition limit. And that wasn't a deposition limit on the total number that could be taken but, instead, on the number THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
that applied to depositions of amici. And in another state, North Dakota -- that was in the Montana versus Wyoming case. And even with those third-party limits, which I believe were a limit of 10 for the other state, for example, the total number of depositions taken by the parties was more than 60 between them. And that case was about a Compact; and the issue was, I would suggest, far more narrow than our issues here. It dealt with a change in Wyoming on the Yellowstone River from flood irrigation to sprinkler irrigation.

Here I would say that the scope of the activities in this case warrant at least 40 to 45 depositions. Let me start, if I might, with Georgia's interrogatory responses. They have identified 162 personnel with relevant knowledge from 10 Georgia state agencies. Georgia, in that same interrogatory response, identified at least 20 topics relevant to discovery with respect to their personnel alone.

I can read through those, but let me instead summarize that we are dealing with a THE REPORTING GROUP
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dispute with a 25 -year history going back decades, parties engaged in comprehensive studies together. There was a failed Compact, multiple rounds of federal agency litigation. And here we are seeking not only that historical background, but also -- as it's relevant, but also specific data, documents, and other information from 35 Georgia counties, 28 water districts, on municipal, industrial, and agricultural water withdrawals and returns, water planning information, and the like.

And, further, with respect to some of the third-party activity we're engaged in, we believe that our discovery will show that Georgia's position in this case is contradicted by decades of analyses by its own university scientists, by some number of federal scientists, and a range of other independent analysts.

So, in short, there is quite a lot for us to cover here. And I might hasten to add that it's premature at this stage for us to know precisely all of the nonnoticed deponents at this stage.
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Complete document discovery is due on November 10 as are interrogatory responses. And as we're beginning our depositions now, we certainly will want to follow the leads. We want to pursue information that we get from initial witnesses with others.

As I indicated a bit ago, we have a plan to complete all these depositions by the deadline. We're contemplating 12 to 14 in October, a similar number in November. And we think that given our staffing and Mr. Primis's staffing -- both of the states are represented by large law firms -- that we can comfortably complete that. Certainly a lot of work, but we don't have any doubt that it's doable.

One final note, your Honor, if I might. It's been a pleasure to cooperate with Mr. Primis in addressing this dispute together. I will note that I believe Georgia served to date 13 notices. They, I think, have others to serve. Among their existing notices are several -- I should say three 30(b)(6)'s with collectively maybe 40 specifications or more. The 30(b)(6) to Florida has 28 specifications and would
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itself call for, we think, maybe five to seven witnesses. So I would submit, your Honor, that Georgia itself may be already near or soon to exceed its own proposed limit.

Thank you, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. Thank you
for scheduling this hearing on such short
notice. We appreciate it.
The Case Management Plan 5.2.8 specifically contemplates that the Special Master will determine the number and length of depositions; and we have reached out to your Honor under that provision to ask that we set some reasonable depositions that will allow both sides to get the information they need, but that will provide for more focused and efficient discovery and avoid what we're concerned about, which is a scattershot approach where a lot of days and hours are spent in depositions and preparing for depositions that could have been avoided with some foresight and discussions between the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
parties and with some meaningful limits.
As Mr. Perry indicated, they already noticed or identified 34 separate depositions. They have eight to 10 more, although I think Mr. Perry -- I heard him say today they believe it's at least 40 to 45. And as I suspect, with no limit they will also notice up additional people that they learn about or identify through this initial slate of 45, if time permits.

And as your Honor noted, the depositions under the Case Management Plan are allowed to go for up to three days. So we're looking at multiples of that. It could be two to three times the 45 minimum that they have identified. And that's not to even mention the depositions that Georgia is entitled to take and that we plan to take. And if there is no limit, which is what Florida wants, we will likely have to increase the number that we take just to counter all the discovery that Florida is taking.

We have been clear all along with Florida that both sides ought to be able to live within reasonable limits. We have had a THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
Mason \& Lockhart
lengthy meet and confer. I initially raised this limit idea back in August. We reraised it on September 11. And Florida said it would consider it. And since that time -right after I indicated that we believed there ought to be limits and that we would consider seeking that relief from the Special Master, they issued six deposition notices. On the 15th I said we should accelerate this discussion and get to the Special Master quickly if we can't resolve it. And in the next week they issued 12 more deposition notices. And so at that point we said this is getting a little out of hand, and we reached out to your Honor on September 23.

In order to get all the work that needs to be done by January 15 , we think it is -it is essential to have some limitation on the number of depositions. There are only 73 business days left in discovery. And even with large teams from multiple law firms that are handling this case, three times 80 or 90 depositions could be over 200 days of depositions. And it's just not necessary; and we shouldn't do -- undertake that kind of THE REPORTING GROUP
work just for the sake of doing it.
Mr. Perry noted that we have served a 30(b)(6) notice. And given the size and scope of the number of people working on these issues on each state, we think that's the most efficient way to get at the discovery that's needed. And rather than have both sides guess at who within each state's bureaucracies and organizations have pieces of information that could be relevant, we proposed to have a 30(b)(6) to compile that. And if Florida is correct that they can handle our 30(b)(6) in five to seven witnesses, that would be terrific and quite efficient because we would then get the most essential information with just five to seven people instead of searching around the State of Florida to find everyone who could have information on those issues. And I suspect that a number of those people who would be identified for those topics -- and we're still awaiting their identification -- would be people we would depose individually anyways. So we can economize and streamline by doing it that way.
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Instead, what we have been receiving are multiple deposition notices to the same units or the same organizations with multiple people who have overlapping information where two, three, four depositions are being noticed for information that could be easily sought from the one person who is most knowledgeable and best situated to provide it.

That's happened with Georgia's hydrology unit where multiple modelers are being sought where there is one person who could likely provide all the information. The Georgia Water Resources Institute, similar multiple deposition notices. U.S. Fish and Wildlife, I believe they have indicated they want four people from that organization.

And then there is this group, the ACF Stakeholders, who have done their own study of the water in the ACF Basin. And Florida ran into a snag with that group. Georgia doesn't control it. It's independent. But they couldn't get the modeling and data and information that they wanted for their experts from the ACF Stakeholders. So THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
instead of moving to compel and just getting the data that their experts need, they noticed up everyone who was involved in conducting that study, generating yet additional duplicative depositions.

So what we have proposed and tried to engage with Florida on is to set a reasonable limit, work with each other, and meet and confer to identify the people who have the greatest amount of information and will provide the biggest bang for the buck in terms of accomplishing the discovery that needs to get done.

And, of course, if there are critical people or critical issues as we start to wrap up our work in January that need to get done, both sides would be reasonable and allow for some bit of additional discovery before the deadline hits. We just think it's a much more orderly and efficient way to go rather than try to get everybody who may have information and -- scheduled and done in this short time frame.

The -- just to respond to one point that Mr. Perry made with regard to the limits in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

| 17 | 19 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 other cases, one of the things that original | 1 We don't anticipate that many |
| 2 actions have been criticized for is for going | 2 depositions will go the full three days. |
| 3 on at great length and for not coming to a | 3 Many will be only one day. Perhaps the vast |
| 4 close. Your Honor has taken a strong stand | 4 majority will be one day or perhaps two days. |
| 5 against that with some very firm deadlines | 5 Mr. Primis made a comment about the ACF |
| 6 that we have all been working against. But | 6 Stakeholders issue. Just to clear the air |
| 7 just because some cases in the past have | 7 briefly on that, if I might, we have hundreds |
| 8 ballooned somewhat out of control resulting | 8 of thousands of pages of material from the |
| 9 in hundreds of depositions, it's hard to see | 9 consultants that prepared the study that's at |
| 10 how that would be necessary or appropriate in | 10 issue there, and that's what we're deposing |
| 11 any case; it certainly wouldn't be a | 11 people on currently. That starts tomorrow. |
| 12 precedent for the work that needs to get done | 12 So it's not as if we are out fishing for |
| 13 here in the remaining 73 business days for | 13 documents. We have documents. We have many |
| 14 discovery. | 14 documents. They're -- there are some things |
| 15 So we believe that both sides working | 15 that are being withheld still; and we may |
| 16 together can get it done with many fewer | 16 require some help going forward with that. |
| 17 depositions, much less cost and imposition on | 17 But we're trying to do that in an economical |
| 18 both the states and these third parties. | 18 fashion. |
| 19 That's why we raised the issue with your | 19 And, frankly, we were trying to avoid |
| 20 Honor. | 20 imposing a significant expense upon the ACF |
| 21 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you | 21 Stakeholder group because it has limited |
| 22 very much. | 22 funding, at least that's our understanding. |
| 23 Does the United States care to weigh in | 23 So that's the way we're proceeding. |
| 24 on this? | 24 There may be multiple people in key parts of |
| 25 MR. GRAY: No, your Honor. At this THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 Georgia's state framework, state agencies, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
| 18 | 20 |
| 1 point no federal employees have been noticed | 1 that we need to depose, particularly among |
| 2 for deposition that I know of. And I will | 2 the modelers on hydrology because that is a |
| 3 just note that when they are noticed, each | 3 critical element at the core of this case. |
| 4 agency will have to apply Touhy regulations | 4 And they have slightly different |
| 5 and process to determine whether to make | 5 responsibilities. They may have been |
| 6 them available and under what limits they | 6 overlapping. But we hesitate to accept the |
| 7 might be available. Also, it's not a | 7 invitation from Georgia that we just depose |
| 8 foregone conclusion that the federal | 8 the people they designate. |
| 9 employees will be made available for | 9 So with that I would like to close, your |
| 10 depositions even when they are noticed. | 10 Honor. |
| 11 But other than that, our interests at | 11 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you |
| 12 this point are primarily in monitoring the | 12 very much. |
| 13 proceedings. | 13 You mentioned ACF. Does anyone here |
| 14 Thank you. | 14 know Mr. Pendergrast? |
| 15 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida, do | 15 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, it's Phil Perry |
| 16 you wish to make any comments in view of | 16 from Florida. |
| 17 Georgia's argument? | 17 And, your Honor, I have had a couple |
| 18 MR. PERRY: Just briefly, your Honor, if | 18 conversations with Mr. Pendergrast over time. |
| 19 I might. | 19 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anybody from |
| 20 First, we think our real number is 45. | 20 Georgia know him? |
| 21 We don't currently think that we're going to | 21 MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, this is Craig |
| 22 go much above that. It's hard at this stage | 22 Primis from Georgia. |
| 23 to rule out the possibility we might need to | 23 I have not personally spoken with him. |
| 24 go above that. We might be below that | 24 I believe some people from within the state |
| 25 number. | 25 AG's Office have dealt with Mr. Pendergrast. |
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| 21 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 MS. GRANT: This is Britt Grant. | 1 distance -- and I readily admit that I don't |
| 2 And Sarah Warren, the deputy Solicitor | 2 know what I'm talking about here -- it |
| 3 General, has spoken with Mr. Pendergrast. | 3 appears to me that if a document contains the |
| 4 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, I hope | 4 word "water" you each want to see it. And if |
| 5 you weren't offended by the brief e-mail I | 5 a witness uses that word, you want to depose |
| 6 sent him last night. His message came in | 6 him. |
| 7 when I was out of the office around 5 o'clock. | 7 Now, we all know Florida wants more |
| 8 And I dictated the response to him, and Mary | 8 water; Georgia thinks Florida has enough, and |
| 9 sent it. But I meant what I said, even if it | 9 that, ultimately, the Supreme Court will |
| 10 did sound abrupt. | 10 decide who is right and who is wrong. |
| 11 How about Russell Willard, the assistant | 11 Stepping back, I wonder if another meet |
| 12 AG in Georgia; does anyone know him? | 12 and confer session on limiting the scope of |
| 13 MS. GRANT: Yes, sir. This is Britt | 13 discovery would be productive. You could |
| 14 Grant in Georgia. I know Mr. Willard. | 14 talk about the issues you each believe |
| 15 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Is he -- | 15 necessary to enable and inform judgment; and, |
| 16 MR. PERRY: This is Phil Perry from | 16 if you agree, you could limit discovery going |
| 17 Florida. | 17 forward to those issues, hopefully, thereby |
| 18 Our team here have had a couple | 18 limiting the scope of the entire process. |
| 19 conversations with Mr. Willard over time. | 19 The electronic discovery procedure agreement |
| 20 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. | 20 is a perfect example of what such a |
| 21 Well, I assume you don't expect me to rule at | 21 cooperative approach could produce. |
| 22 the moment. I will want to see the | 22 Now, there is no need to comment. This |
| 23 transcript and get the citations and take a | 23 is just a suggestion on my part along with |
| 24 look at them and be able to consult with my | 24 the usual suggestion about continuing further |
| 25 case manager, Mr. Dunlap. We'll get you a THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
| 22 | 24 |
| 1 decision as soon as possible, understanding | 1 Anything further? |
| 2 the time limits that you have and the need | 2 Florida? |
| 3 you have for resolution of this issue. | 3 MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. |
| 4 Before we -- | 4 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? |
| 5 MR. PERRY: Your Honor? | 5 MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. |
| 6 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sir? | 6 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: United |
| 7 I'm sorry. What did you say? | 7 States? |
| 8 MR. PERRY: I was just registering my | 8 MR. GRAY: No, your Honor. |
| 9 thanks, your Honor. | 9 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you |
| 10 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Okay. Who is | 10 all. We'll get you the decision just as soon |
| 11 that? Mr. Perry? | 11 as I possibly can. |
| 12 MR. PERRY: It's Phil Perry from | 12 MR. PERRY: Thank you. |
| 13 Florida. | 13 MR. PRIMIS: Thank you. |
| 14 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, | 14 MS. GRANT: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 15 Mr. Perry. | 15 (The telephone conference was concluded |
| 16 While I have got you, let me -- I | 16 at 10:26 a.m.) |
| 17 probably shouldn't do this; but I can't | 17 - - |
| 18 resist. You have heard me over and over | 18 |
| 19 compliment competent counsel -- and, | 19 |
| 20 thankfully, you all are competent counsel -- | 20 |
| 21 on each progress report, which always states | 21 |
| 22 that you are meeting and conferring; and each | 22 |
| 23 report also recites the increasingly | 23 |
| 24 expanding number of documents, hard copies | 24 |
| 25 and electronic, you're chasing. From a | 25 |
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