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## PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning, counsel.

MR. PERRY: Good morning, your Honor.
MR. ALLEN: Your Honor.
MS. GRANT: Your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let's start.
We have Josh Dunlap, case manager; Mary Clifford, legal assistant; and as fortunate as we can be, we have Claudette here this morning.

Let's start with appearances. Florida?
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, this is Phil
Perry for Florida. And on the phone are
Allen Winsor, Os Vazquez, John Cooper, and Abid Qureshi.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And,
Mr. Perry, will you be the principal speaker?
MR. PERRY: I will, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Georgia?
MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor.
This is Winn Allen on behalf of Georgia from Kirkland \& Ellis. On the phone with me I THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
believe we have Britt Grant from the Florida -- from the Georgia Solicitor General's Office as well as Sarah Warren from the Georgia Solicitor General's Office. I think that's it for Georgia.

MS. GRANT: Yes, your Honor; that's correct.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And will you be the principal speaker?

MR. ALLEN: Yes, your Honor; I will.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: United States?

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

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning, Mr. Gray. From my review of the progress reports, I doubt that there is anything that the United States will want to comment on; but I'm not -- while I'm not going to call on you directly, if you have anything that you want to comment on, please feel free to do so. Okay?

MR. GRAY: Yes. Thank you.
Mr. ALLEN: Your Honor, I -- this is
Mr. Allen, again, from Kirkland. I neglected THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
to mention one of $m y$ colleagues who is also on the phone. Devora Allon is also on. I just wanted to put that on the record.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

Well, let's begin by asking; today is the last day for production of document requests. Is that complete, Georgia?

MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, we expect to make our final production today. And that will be -- that will complete our document production in the case. So for our -- from our perspective, it will be done.

We have also received correspondence from the State of Florida letting us know that they're going to be producing 570,000 pages of documents today. And I'll let Mr. Perry speak as to whether that completes their production.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry?
MR. PERRY: Our document production will be complete today, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

Now, the progress reports indicate that THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart

|  |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | there is a dispute or has been a dispute |
| 2 | regarding production of professors' e-mails. |
| 3 | How many professors' e-mails are at issue, |
| 4 | Florida? |
| 5 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, currently the |
| 6 | principal professor is Professor Georgakakos |
| 7 | from Georgia Tech. There are two others. |
| 8 | One is retired, Professor Hook; and then |
| 9 | Professor Masters, I believe, from Albany |
| 10 | State University. I don't believe that any |
| 11 | of those three issues are yet ripe for |
| 12 | decision by the Court under the terms of the |
| 13 | Case Management Plan, but it's our desire to |
| 14 | move very quickly forward on those. |
| 15 | We are still awaiting production from |
| 16 | Albany State University, so we're not yet |
| 17 | sure for Mr. Masters; and we may have some |
| 18 | doubts as to Professor Hook as well. But as |
| 19 | to Dr. Georgakakos, we believe that a meet |
| 20 | and confer tomorrow or the next day ought to |
| 21 | make that mature for any resolution we may |
| 22 | need from the Court. |
| 23 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? |
| 24 | MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, yes. We'll meet |
| 25 | and confer with Florida with regard to the |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |

there is a dispute or has been a dispute
professors' e-mails. I will say that for us, we're going to continue to discuss this with Florida; but this presents a different issue from the -- from the e-mail issue you might remember regarding Dr. Kistenmacher. He identified a specific folder of documents. For these three professors, in particular for Dr. Georgakakos, there's a much, much larger volume of e-mails. In the case of Dr. Georgakakos, I believe it's at least -there are somewhere over 20,000 e-mails. So from Georgia's perspective, it presents a much more significant burden issue this late in the production, particularly given the history of, you know, we thought this issue had been resolved six months ago.

But as Mr. Perry says, we're continuing to meet and confer and discuss this with Florida; and we're happy to do that over this week if we can. But it's a much more significant burden issue than was the case with respect to Dr. Kistenmacher.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, if I might respond?

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, please.
MR. PERRY: I apologize.
If I might respond briefly, it's
our desire to narrow the issues for
Dr. Georgakakos; so it's not anything like the burden that Mr. Allen has identified. And that is indeed something we started to do and have done to some large extent already. But that's the purpose of the meet and confer this week in our opinion.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
With regard to other written discovery, what's the status regarding Florida's written discovery responses as to harm? Georgia?

MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, regarding Florida's written discovery responses, we have had some back and forth with Florida over the past couple months. Florida supplemented once, I believe, a few months ago; and Georgia continued to believe that those supplements were inadequate.

We received from Florida new discovery responses last night, pretty late last night, as well as some supplements to some earlier discovery responses that were made. To be THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
honest with you, we just got them late last night; so we're still in the process of reviewing them.

I know our position before last night was that the interrogatory responses we received to date were not at all sufficient with respect to specifically identifying the specific injury that Florida is claiming in this case which, again, we think is a very, very important issue both because proving a real and substantial injury that's caused by Georgia in some fashion is a threshold issue that we think is very important.

So before last night we would have taken the position that Florida's written interrogatory responses to date were not sufficient on that issue. But, again, we received a lot of interrogatory responses last night; and I don't want to prejudge that. Let me take some time and look at it, and we'll discuss it with Florida.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry?
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, if I might
address that briefly.
Before last night we had three rounds of THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
supplemental interrogatory responses on the harm that is being suffered and will be suffered by Florida. And in those responses, we identified more than 300 pages -- 300 separate reports and data sets identifying harm to species in the river and in the bay. Last night, we identified through more than 100 pages of interrogatory responses additional details. And collectively between those various efforts we now have something like 400 reports and data sets. We have identified oysters, six types of crayfish, various mussel types, dozens of species of freshwater and estuarine fish, many types of estuarine phytoplankton, zooplankton, various types of crabs and shrimp, amphibians, reptiles, and birds, all that are impacted by the reduced flows caused by Georgia's upstream consumption.

It's our position that we had more than satisfied the interrogatories prior to this production last night of new interrogatory responses. But I think at this point, it's going to be hard to say that we have not reasonably disclosed all of our contentions, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
your Honor.
MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, if I might just respond briefly?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, please.
MR. ALLEN: Just two responses that
Florida has cited a lot of articles in their interrogatories, many of which aren't specific to the Apalachicola region; they just deal with general issues with respect to certain species. And it's our position that you can't just cite a bunch of articles on general issues and then say, our injury is in there; you know, go find it somewhere. We think that much more specificity is required so that we can conduct, if necessary, fact discovery and also retain the necessary experts to really drill down on what specific issues Florida is alleging.

And the second issue, I think, your Honor, is that I know your question was specific to written discovery; but Georgia does feel very strongly that Florida also has an obligation to put up a 30(b)(6) witness on this issue, on the issues of what injury it's suffering. And we served the 30(b)(6) notice THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to discuss these issues -- to take deposition testimony from Florida witnesses on this issue.

And I think you have seen from our status report that Florida has objected to putting up a witness on the harm that might be suffered by animal and plant species, by economic -- what economic injury it suffered, what sociological injury it suffered. We do think it's very important that there be a 30(b)(6) witness from the State of Florida who will testify to these injuries and that Georgia not be limited to interrogatory responses on this.

So I just want to raise that and say that we do intend to push for an interrogatory -- for a 30(b)(6) witness on injury issues. I understand that from a conversation one of my colleagues had last night with Mr. Perry that Florida is willing to meet and confer on that; but we very, very much hope that Florida would reconsider its objections on the 30(b)(6) issue so that we can take a deposition of relevant fact witnesses on this issue.

## THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry?
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I think we see the 30(b)(6) point a little bit differently than Mr. Allen does. It's not our position that we won't produce any 30(b)(6) witness. It hasn't been our position that we won't. Instead, our position is that the type of specifications you have under 30(b)(6) are so broad and nonspecific that they pose two very different but related types of problems.

First, you're essentially -- and I should say I mean by you're, Georgia is asking for premature expert testimony, conclusions based on data and reports and data sets and specific information by our experts about exactly how all the species are identified, are being harmed, how economic issues are implicated, and all those sorts of things.

Second, there's just a practical problem here. And it's -- it's that the specifications are so broad that Georgia is in some respects essentially asking us to put up a 30(b)(6) witness on, you know, 400 studies and other significant volume of THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
information. It would be like asking for a single 30(b)(6) witness on volumes A through C of Encyclopedia Britannica.

We think there is a way to work through that. We think there is a way to narrow these issues so they're specific and factual and that Georgia can get the type of witness it needs. I'll add that it already has, I believe, something like 42 noticed depositions at this stage, and a number of the witnesses they have noticed will have relevant information. But more than that, there are a line of federal cases, several of them, that say essentially that in certain circumstances, a party may properly restrict a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition on the grounds that information -- the information sought is more appropriately discoverable through contention interrogatories.

Now, as I say, we're not taking the position that no 30(b)(6) witness will be made available. We're asking Georgia to consider the implications for premature expert disclosure and the implications that arise just from the practical question of how
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can we possibly have somebody testify about the breadth of information at issue here?

Ultimately when we disclose, according to the Court's schedule, our experts, they will rely on the type of information we have supplied to Georgia. They will analyze it. They will present conclusions based on it. But we think that there's a way to solve Georgia's problem without particularly implicating the concerns I addressed. And that is indeed what we would like to confer on this week.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, if I might? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
MR. ALLEN: If I may respond?
Just a couple responses. First of all, we're not seeking expert testimony on this. We're seeking factual issues and the factual bases for the harm that Florida is alleging. I mean, Florida is the one who brought suit against Georgia. They must have some factual bases for having done that and some factual bases for why they believe they're being harmed by Georgia's upstream water usage. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

We're entitled to probe that through a 30(b)(6) deposition.

The second point, your Honor, is it isn't some, like, difficult issue that Florida can't wrap its head around. I mean, there are entire agencies in Florida that are focused on species and animals and things of that nature. So this is things that employees in Florida do as part of their regular job is they presumably -- and I believe this is true -- that they monitor species in the Apalachicola region and have an understanding as to what might be harming them or what might not be harming them.

We're actually asking for factual testimony on that. And I don't think it's overbroad to say identify for us the animal and plant species you think are being harmed. Identify for us what economic injury you think you're suffering.

I understand that there might be some expert testimony components to that. There is also certainly factual parts of that and factual testimony that's part of that and factual facts that form the basis of that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
expert testimony. And we're entitled as a defendant in a case that's been brought against us to take discovery on that.

So we're going to meet and confer with Florida on the 30(b)(6) issue. Happy to do that and see if we can reach a compromise here. But Georgia does view this as a very, very important issue that we felt necessary to raise sooner rather than later.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry?
MR. PERRY: Well, I think we can reach an agreement as to the factual predicate for some of their requests through a meet and confer process. So I'm happy to hear Mr. Allen focus his comments on that, and I hope we can make progress this week on that and other issues.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, do you anticipate scheduling additional depositions promptly now that the document production will be complete as of midnight tonight?

MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, this is Mr. Allen. We anticipate -- we have been working very hard to schedule depositions.

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

| Telephone Conference - 11/10/15 Florida v. Georgia |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 17 |  | 19 |
| 1 | With a large number of depositions, there is | 1 | We're happy to meet and confer with |
| 2 | obviously a lot of coordination that has to | 2 | Florida again. They were just served |
| 3 | go on between witness availability and | 3 | yesterday. So if Florida has concerns about |
| 4 | counsel availability. But we anticipate | 4 | the responses, they can raise them; and we'll |
| 5 | expeditiously moving forward with scheduling | 5 | do the same for the responses we received |
| 6 | any and all remaining depositions that we can | 6 | from Florida last night. We'll review them. |
| 7 | in the next week or the next two weeks. | 7 | And if we have concerns, we'll raise them |
| 8 | That's something we very much want to -- | 8 | with counsel for Florida. |
| 9 | there's a number on the schedule now; but we | 9 | (Discussion off the record.) |
| 10 | want to get as many as we can scheduled as | 10 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Just a |
| 11 | soon as possible and work with Florida to | 11 | minute, please. |
| 12 | schedule whatever depositions they might want | 12 | MR. PERRY: I apologize. My fault. |
| 13 | to get scheduled as well. | 13 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Okay. Let's |
| 14 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry? | 14 | go ahead now and give those numbers slowly. |
| 15 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we had the same | 15 | MR. PERRY: I will, your Honor. I |
| 16 | approach. I will say that the availability | 16 | apologize for moving quickly. |
| 17 | of Dr. Georgakakos's and the other two | 17 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: This is |
| 18 | gentlemen's e-mail are important to us in | 18 | Mr. Perry? |
| 19 | making progress on our depositions; but we | 19 | MR. PERRY: That's right. Mr. Perry for |
| 20 | are indeed trying to move as quickly as we | 20 | Florida. |
| 21 | possibly can. Hopefully, we can resolve some | 21 | Nos. 28, 29, 31, 41, and 42. |
| 22 | of these issues at the meet and confer this | 22 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. |
| 23 | week. | 23 | MR. PERRY: Thank you. |
| 24 | Also, I note, if I might -- I know it | 24 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me turn |
| 25 | may be a little premature; but in the <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | now to third parties. Are there any THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 18 |  | 20 |
| 1 | interest of full disclosure, since Georgia | 1 | outstanding concerns regarding the response |
| 2 | put on the table its interrogatory responses | 2 | of the U.S. agencies, the Touhy requests? |
| 3 | last night, we have noted that they declined | 3 | Florida? |
| 4 | to answer a few of the interrogatories. And | 4 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we think the |
| 5 | I think the principal reason is they don't | 5 | United States has produced most of the |
| 6 | believe that some of the issues we're probing | 6 | documents that we have sought. There may be |
| 7 | are relevant to the case. That may be the | 7 | a few odds and ends still to discuss with the |
| 8 | subject of our meet and confer this week as | 8 | United States. And I think we want to |
| 9 | well, and I'm hoping to resolve that issue | 9 | discuss with them further the depositions we |
| 10 | quickly. | 10 | have had in mind. |
| 11 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Allen, do | 11 | I note that we may be making progress on |
| 12 | you want to respond to that last comment? | 12 | at least some of them, but it requires some |
| 13 | MR. ALLEN: Yes, your Honor, I do. | 13 | additional conversation. And that's |
| 14 | Like I said, I don't recall, sitting | 14 | something that we put a high priority on and |
| 15 | here right now, us declining to respond | 15 | are likely to pursue in the next week. |
| 16 | because something is not relevant. I recall | 16 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Allen? |
| 17 | us declining to respond on one interrogatory | 17 | MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, yes. All I know |
| 18 | because it was completely duplicative of one | 18 | about is that we're trying to schedule the |
| 19 | that had been served earlier. I recall us | 19 | depositions. I don't believe we have any |
| 20 | having some -- some trouble understanding | 20 | outstanding document production concerns from |
| 21 | what it was that Florida was asking in | 21 | the U.S. agencies. I believe we're just |
| 22 | another interrogatory. But sitting here | 22 | scheduling depositions. |
| 23 | today, I don't recall us responding because | 23 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: How about |
| 24 | we didn't think something was relevant; but I | 24 | outstanding concerns regarding other third |
| 25 | could be wrong. I just don't remember that. | 25 | parties? Florida? |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
|  | Mason \& Lockhart |  | Mason \& Lockhart |

MR. PERRY: Well, yes, your Honor. There is a subpoena to Black \& Veatch. And they have produced a wide range of documents to us, but not specific e-mails of the type we have identified in our status report -- in fact, multiple status reports. Atkins, I believe, is still going to produce documents to us. And we're awaiting those.

So there may be some issues that we may need judicial assistance with. I'm not certain we do though. We may be able to get what we need from both of those parties, and so it may be premature to identify that as a genuine problem.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Allen?
MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, Georgia, I'm pretty sure, has no outstanding issues with third parties regarding other issues.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you both.

Let me just ask -- well, before I turn to some final things here, is there anything else that you want to raise, Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: If I might, your Honor, I would note Georgia's point at the end of its THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
status report about the prospect of mediation. And I will say that we agree that it could be helpful to us and to Georgia in particular if our discussions on a potential settlement could be officiated by a sharp and effective mediator. Our concern is that it may take that type of help to actually make progress. And so we welcome that suggestion. And I called Georgia's counsel yesterday to begin the process of identifying such a person.

And, your Honor, if you have suggestions or advice for us on that, we would be very happy to take your advice and follow through.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let me say, before I ask Georgia to respond, that I was pleased to see the word, quote, settlement, unquote, in one of the progress reports and the suggestion of mediation. I think that came from Georgia. Am I correct?

MR. ALLEN: You are correct, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And I now
understand that Florida would entertain mediation as well?

MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, I think the process of selecting a mediator depends upon a number of things. First of all, I think you need to decide whether you want someone who is an expert in water law or someone who knows nothing about water law. I think that the -- at first the two states should get together, as you're planning to do, and see if you can agree on the form of mediation, No. 1; No. 2, on a specific mediator.

If you want me involved in that process, I'm happy to get involved. But I think it's better if the two states can agree between themselves.

I can make suggestions for mediators, but I prefer not to for obvious reasons. I think the selection process is important -very important; but I'm delighted, and I can't overemphasize the fact that I'm delighted to see both the word "settlement" and the word "mediator" in the reports and to know that you're moving towards that process because, frankly, your persistent refusal to narrow the scope of this litigation is going THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to result in astonishing expenses to the states' taxpayers. And as I have said from the start, if there's anything, any way at all -- any way at all -- that this can be settled, it ought to be done.

So thank you both for making that, and I hope that your -- that attempt; and I hope that your meet and confer will be effective. And I look forward to hearing further on it.

Now, let me say a couple of things in closing. First of all, somewhere in here there was a reference to one side or the other using speaking objections, which I understand from my litigation experience to mean that the attorney was suggesting an answer to the witness. Let me just tell you that I think that is abhorrent. It's a practice that I think is terrible, and I can't believe that experienced and competent as counsel are in this case, that it's actually happening. But let me just warn you that if it is happening and if it ever gets brought to my attention, there will be consequences that will flow from it or because of it.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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