

## PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning, counsel. This is Ralph Lancaster. And I have with me Josh Dunlap, case management assistant; Mary Clifford, who acts as our district court clerk; and Claudette Mason, our court reporter.

So, again, let me begin by reminding you, if you would identify yourself so that the transcript will be clear when you speak. Let's start with Florida.

MR. WINSOR: Good morning, your Honor. This is Allen Winsor. And I'm joined by Chris Kise and Osvaldo Vazquez.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, Mr. Winsor. Will you be the one principally speaking?

MR. WINSOR: I'll do some and Mr. Kise will as well, your Honor, with the Court's permission.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sure.
Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Good morning.
MS. GRANT: Your Honor --
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MR. PRIMIS: Oh, I'm sorry. Excuse me.
MS. GRANT. No, I'm sorry. Good
morning. This is Britt Grant from Georgia, and I have also got Nels Peterson here. And I believe our colleagues from Kirkland are on the line from D.C.

MR. PRIMIS: Yes. Good morning, Special Master Lancaster. This is Craig Primis at Kirkland \& Ellis. With me are Sarah Warren and Winn Allen, also of this firm. And I believe Ms. Grant and I will be the principal people speaking for Georgia today.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
This morning we also have with us some representatives of third parties who have asked for an extension of time to respond. There are three.

Let's start with the City of Albany.
MR. DAVIS: Good morning, your Honor. This is Nathan Davis. I'm the city attorney in Albany, Georgia. And I'm over in our engineering department with our director of engineering Bruce Maples, and Lee Daniel.

I'll probably do most of the talking; but Mr. Maples, with your Honor's permission, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
may have something to add.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: City of
Americus?
MR. SKIPPER: Good morning, your Honor. This is Jimmy Skipper in Americus, Georgia. I'm the city attorney for Americus. And I'm here by myself, so I guess I'll be doing the talking from the City of Americus.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, Mr. Skipper.

Cherokee County?
MR. ROBIN: Good morning, your Honor. This is Ken Robin, and I'm with the law firm of Jarrard \& Davis. We are county attorneys for Cherokee County, and $I$ will be doing all the talking for them this morning.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Is there anyone else on the line who has not been identified?

MR. GRAY: Yes, your Honor. This is Michael Gray from the Department of Justice on behalf of the United States. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And will
there be anyone else on behalf of the United States this morning?

MR. GRAY: Not this morning.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right.
Fine. Let's start with the requests by the third parties and the City of Albany. Mr. Davis?

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, your Honor. We're requesting a $30-d a y$ extension for the completion. We feel like we can begin production as required; but due to the voluminous nature and that the request, as much as possible, be in native format, we're still at what $I$ will call a preliminary stage of trying to determine what is a native format.

And we're larger than Americus, but we're still not a large city. So we just need the extra time, if your Honor would grant it.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Davis, did you get a notice of the deadines that were set by section --

MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir. That material THE REPORTING GROUP
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came with the subpoena.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And what did it say?

MR. DAVIS: The initial -- excuse me one second. We understood there were three deadlines in the material. The one we're asking for the extension was the completion of discovery. The completion date is April 27 of 2015. And we're asking for a completion date to be extended to May 27.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Did the
notice that you received also refer to section 6.1.3 of the CMP?

Let me help you, if $I$ can.
MR. DAVIS: Sure. Yes, sir.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Did it tell you that you had to respond within 10 days?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir. We thought we made that deadline when -- we were served on January 27; and we made a request on February 5. So we felt like we met that 10-day deadline, yes, sir.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, I'm asking because our records, as submitted by the progress reports, indicated that service THE REPORTING GROUP
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was made on January 23. Is that incorrect?
MR. DAVIS: Well, the document I'm looking at for sure looks like a 7 to me, your Honor.

MR. WINSOR: Your Honor, this is Allen Winsor for Florida, if $I$ may.

The status report reflected the day that the subpoenas were served on opposing counsel. And we had to arrange -- which was done by e-mail pursuant to the Court's -- and regular mail pursuant to the Court's Order. The subpoenas were served on the third parties separately on different dates according to when they were able to be served.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right.
Thank you very much, Mr. Winsor.
MR. WINSOR: Yes, sir.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Davis, do you want to expand a little bit on the need for additional time?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir. The -- with all due respect to counsel, the broad nature of the subpoena which begins -- every item begins with the word "all" and the fact that THE REPORTING GROUP
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we're not used to having to produce documents to this extent, quite frankly. And our
engineering department is doing the best that they can to begin. And $I$ feel overwhelmed is what it amounts to, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Does Florida object to the request?

MR. WINSOR: No -- this is Allen Winsor. No, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MS. GRANT: No, your Honor; we have no objection.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry. Would you identify yourself, please?

MS. GRANT: I apologize. This is Britt Grant.

And Georgia has no objection.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Since there is no objection by either of the two parties, the motion is granted; and an additional 10 days -- an additional 30 days will be added onto the time for full response.

Is there anything else, Mr. Davis?
MR. DAVIS: No, sir.
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Thank you, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Now, let's turn to Mr. Skipper and the City of Americus.

MR. DAVIS: Are we excused, your Honor?
Georgia -- Albany, Georgia, are we
excused from the rest of the hearing?
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, you are.
I assumed you would hang up.
MR. DAVIS: Okay. Thank you very much, judge.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Mr. Skipper?
MR. SKIPPER: Your Honor, please. This is Jimmy Skipper. I'm the city attorney for Americus.

We have similar issues with the City of Albany. We were served on January the 28 th, and yesterday was our 10 days. And we filed a request yesterday for the $30-d a y$ extension.

Our issue is we're a town of about 16,000 people. I have got a public works director who runs our water system and our sewer system. And we actually contract out with a private company to assist in running THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the water system. And $I$ have met with all of those folks, and they have the -- they have got the -- most of the documents that they think they can get their hands on. And we think we might be able to do it within the 90 days; but my problem is that I'm -- I'm under the impression or $I$ was told when $I$ was talking to the Florida folks about this, they're looking for documents back to 1976, which is almost 40 years. And we can provide the -- we have got a lot of the documents over the last four or five years in electronic format. Prior to that, most of the documents, I'm told, are in boxes in the basement of City Hall. And we have got to go through those boxes to get them -- or let Florida, I guess, go through -- Florida's counsel or whoever would do that go through them. And we're just really trying to get a handle on what all we need to provide, where it is, and that kind of thing. And it's -I'm just -- initially $I$ thought we could do it within the 90 days; and the more I looked at it, and particularly after our meeting with our folks the other day and the private THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
company that does this, they were concerned because of the scattered nature of the documents going back that far they might not be able to do it. We're still going to try to do it within the 90 days; but we sure would like the extra cushion of the 30 days if we -- if the Court would grant us that consideration.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Does Florida object?

MR. WINSOR: This is Allen Winsor.
No, your Honor; we do not.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MS. GRANT: This is Britt Grant.
And, no, your Honor, we do not object either.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right.
Mr. Skipper, your request for a 30-day extension is granted. Thank you very much for participating.

MR. SKIPPER: Thank you, your Honor. I appreciate it. Bye-bye.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Cherokee County?

MR. ROBIN: Thank you, your Honor.
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Yes, similar to Mr. Skipper, I consulted with my clients and folks in the public works department yesterday. And it also -- you know, trying to respond to documentation that we have been told -- I think Florida wants to go back to 1976. There is also just a voluminous amount of boxes in storage that our client is going to have to cull through and go over and review and see if what's in there is responsive and then, if it is, to get it produced to the State of Florida. And we would appreciate an extra 30 days on top of the 90 days for full production as set forth in the subpoena.

And also, just to set the stage, your Honor, Cherokee County was served on January 30 with the subpoena. I served that letter to you yesterday, which was the loth day. Our production deadline, based on that service, is April 30. So we're asking for an extension of 30 days, which $I$ guess that 30 th day would fall on a Saturday, May 30. So I guess technically I'm asking for, I guess, really 32 days so we can get that production extended to that Monday, which I guess would THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
be June 1 .
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Does Florida object?

MR. WINSOR: This is Allen Winsor, your Honor; and, no, we do not.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MS. GRANT: This is Britt Grant.
No, we do not object.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: The motion is granted. You have an additional 30 days. Thank you for your participation.

MR. ROBIN: Thank you, your Honor. Take care.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it occurs to me that we're going to get similar responses from more and more of these third parties. And my inclination is to amend the CMO and grant them all an additional 30 days unless there is objection.

Florida?
MR. WINSOR: No objection, your Honor. This is Allen Winsor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MS. GRANT: Britt Grant. We have no objection.

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, you
will see an amendment to that Order forthcoming shortly.

Now, let's turn, since we no longer have third parties on here, to the status of the discovery. We have received and we have reviewed the status reports which you filed by Florida and Georgia. And at the beginning, $I$ want to compliment counsel. I appreciate your diligence. I appreciate the cooperation reflected and shown in those status reports. And I'm going to, you won't be surprised to know, urge you to continue to cooperate and try to move this matter along as rapidly as possible.

Let me ask; Florida raised concerns regarding potential requests for additional time by nonparties. Are you experiencing any difficulties in dealing with the third parties, Mr. Winsor?

MR. WINSOR: No, your Honor. We have had productive -- our team has had productive discussions with a number of the third parties and have worked through issues. And at this time, we don't have any significant THE REPORTING GROUP
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unresolved issues that we think would require your attention.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me ask Georgia the same question.

MR. PRIMIS: This is Craig Primis for Georgia.

We have not experienced problems as of this point with third parties. We're in discussions with them and will report if we have any; but as of now, they seem to be on a normal path.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, counsel.

I also understand that the parties have expressed concern about completing production within the time frame set by 6.1.2 of the CMP. What efforts are being made to complete production within the required 120 days?

Florida?
MR. KISE: Your Honor, this is Chris Kise.

And let me try and respond briefly that we have, as we set forth in the case management status report, been engaged since early December in the gathering and
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collection of data, documents, and other materials that we believe to be potentially responsive well in advance of the service of formal discovery. And we interviewed quite a number of custodians. We have gathered to date approximately a million pages -- 1 million pages of information that is now being reviewed and sorted for responsiveness to Georgia's discovery requests. We have also gathered a substantial amount of e-mail information from various identified custodians and have engaged in conversations with Georgia which are recounted, $I$ believe, in both of the parties' status reports about a way to streamline the production of e-mail, since that is most certainly going to be the most voluminous of the discovery materials. We have discussed the concept of identification of a discrete set of custodians and then the application of agreed search terms to those accounts such that we will yield a much smaller universe of initial materials to review for purposes of production.

That will save us -- without -- we THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
haven't engaged in that final exercise yet; but just looking at sort of the landscape from where we are now, that certainly will save us countless months of the review and production process, just engaging in that effort.

What we don't know and what leaves us with some cautionary statement regarding the timeline is even after application of that process, the identification of a discrete set of custodians and the use of search terms, we are not yet certain what that will yield, whether that will take the universe from 10 miliion e-mails down to 1 million e-mails, for example -- I'm speaking hypothetically -- or whether it will take the universe from 10 million e-mails down to 10,000. Without getting fully around that process, it's difficult to estimate with any degree of certainty.

Additionally, the parties continue to meet and confer on -- and I think Mr. Primis will agree with this, on what $I$ will say is a very regular basis in terms of our interaction. The conversations have been THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
productive in terms of identifying issues for resolution. We have discussed a -- a -whether it be by telephone or face-to-face meeting of some significant amount of time, a half a day or whatever is required, to work through the objections on both sides. And so we have engaged in every effort, mindful of the schedule, both before and after the service of formal discovery to identify early responsive materials to begin the assembly of production of those materials.

Florida anticipates, as indicated in the status report, that tomorrow we will in fact begin production on time with a significant amount of data and then a significant amount of other documentation provided to the State of Georgia.

We have also had conversations with a number of the third parties about narrowing of the scope of the requests to identify, first and foremost, what it is that they have, what are the records that they have, and how are they kept. And to the extent that they can assist us in determining whether there is something duplicative of THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
what the State of Georgia might have, we have had conversations in that regard as well to narrow this and move it forward.

All of that said, it is still a substantial amount of information. We are not near completion yet of just the gathering process, much less the review process. And so at this stage, having approximately 1 million pages or more of -- of information already gathered and an untold number of relevant and potentially responsive e-mails, we still have a long way to go before we can really say with certainty that we will meet the 120 days.

We are mindful of the Court's desire in that regard, and we are pressing forward. And, hopefully, what we placed in the status report and this short narrative as to what we are doing gives the Court some confidence that we are, in fact, mindful of that and pressing ahead.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

Georgia, let me ask you the same question.
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MR. PRIMIS: Yes. Special Master Lancaster, this is Craig Primis for Georgia.

Like Florida, we have been undertaking an aggressive effort to get around the state, identify where the potentially responsive documents are, and to collect them so that they can be reviewed and ultimately produced in as rapid a time frame as possible. In connection with that, as we have laid out in our status report, we have already met with at least eight state agencies.

And I would underscore that given the nature of Florida's claim, the discovery really cuts across multiple facets of state government and implicates a lot of different aspects of what the government of Georgia does. So, for instance, we don't -- we obviously have to meet with and collect materials from the Environmental Protection Division and the Department of Natural Resources, which have been immensely cooperative. And it's taking a significant effort on their part, a lot of focus on the public servants working there. But we also need to talk to the Department of Agriculture THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Office of Planning and Budget because there are economic issues in an equitable apportionment case. The Department of Community Affairs, Environmental Finance Authority, Wildlife Resources Division, all of these agencies will have some different aspect and some different set of responsive documents to Florida's request. And we are reaching out to all of them, really, on a simultaneous basis to do this as rapidly as possible.

One thing that we do when we visit with them is we have technical experts from an electronically stored information consulting firm, which is on-site with us to extract that material simultaneously and on a real-time basis because much of it is electronically stored. And for the hundreds of thousands, if not millions of hard copy pages of documents, those all need to be scanned. So it's just a very wide-ranging and voluminous process to collect and sort all the material that is potentially responsive.

Now, counsel for Florida is correct. THE REPORTING GROUP
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The parties have been working together on a regular basis, if not weekly, frequently more than weekly basis, coordinating and communicating to try and find a way so that we can streamline all of that material and review it and produce it on a more timely basis. So as mentioned, we are negotiating the use of electronic search terms at least on e-mail. And given the volume, we may need to expand that to other electronically-stored information. We are trying to limit the number of custodians that will ultimately have to be reviewed and produced. So all of this material is being collected certainly by Georgia, sounds like Florida as well. It's all being loaded into very extensive electronic data bases housed and managed by expert consulting firms, at least on our side. And we will then -- the next step, once we have negotiated out the search terms, have a very large group of contract attorneys who are going to help us sort through this massive amount of information in as rapid a fashion as possible.
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We don't have the exact size on that yet, but $I$ can tell you it will be substantial. And we are nearing the point where we're going to have that apparatus in place as well.

So to summarize, we have a broad-based and aggressive collection effort underway. We are working collaboratively with Florida to find a way on both sides to streamline and focus what's reviewed so that it doesn't -so that it can be in as compressed a time frame as possible. And we are ramping up the size of the team that will help us cut through all this material so that it can be done in as efficient a way as possible.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you
very much. I -- let me -- before $I$ move on, let me just say that $I$, again, am very impressed with and encourage continued cooperation between counsel. I think the enormity of what has been undertaken here is obvious; and without that kind of cooperation, we're going to get stuck. But I think that if you continue to cooperate, we can perhaps meet some -- at least some of the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
deadlines.
Before we move on, let me ask; are there any issues that either Florida or Georgia wishes to bring up related to the status of discovery that you are currently aware of?

MR. WINSOR: This is Allen Winsor, your Honor.

Nothing from Florida other than what we discussed already.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, yes. Craig Primis for Georgia.

I just wanted to add one point to my prior statement, which is that, like Florida, we will also be meeting the first deadline for production and will -- and that's tomorrow. We will be providing, like Florida, models, water models, data base, permits, and other types of data-driven information as well as regular documents. And we will be making a substantial production of that material tomorrow.

In terms of issues to raise, I think the only one that $I$ would want to raise for the Court is that -- and it's a collaborative THE REPORTING GROUP
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productive one; but we are very close to completing our ESI, electronically stored information, protocol. And I suspect that the parties will be jointly presenting that to the special master in the very near future.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

Let's turn now to the United States and its Statement of Intended Participation. Mr. Gray, will you be addressing this?

MR. GRAY: Yes, your Honor. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have about it. I didn't intend to present any affirmative presentation on it; but if you have questions, I'm happy to attempt to answer them.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I assumed Florida and Georgia both received a copy. Florida?

MR. WINSOR: Allen Winsor. Yes, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MS. GRANT: Yes, your Honor.
This is Britt Grant.
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SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Gray, let me ask you; when did the United States decide that it wanted to participate as an amicus and not as an intervenor?

MR. GRAY: Well, I think we held more of a continuing view of our participation. We were invited by the Court to participate as amicus. And we engaged in an internal process to determine whether to intervene at this point and concluded that at least in the -- as the case is currently framed, there is no -- we're not going to intervene. That decision -- I don't have a precise date on it; but it was made within -- in final form within the last week.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And if it was made -- why did it take so long for the United States to decide that it wanted to participate as an amicus?

MR. GRAY: Well, we had internal discussions with at least two federal agencies, our -- the Environmental and Natural Resources Division and the Solicitor General's Office. And we had a request to have discussions with at least one of the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
states about that. And we granted that request and had a meeting, and that process ramped itself up in the last week.

As you know, it can be an extensive process coordinating these events with all of the relevant agencies. And so we -- we filed the statement as soon as we could get it ready.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, I appreciate that. I -- I suggest to you that if my memory is correct, you were asked -the United States was asked to act as an amicus by the Court, filed -- then filed a very comprehensive, very thoroughly researched brief, which the Court promptly ignored. And then we have been going at this now for some time, since my appointment. My question really was why it took so long for the United States to decide to continue as an amicus rather than an intervenor. What took so long?

MR. GRAY: I'm not sure what $I$ can add other than what $I$ have said, which is that we wanted to -- I mean, I guess I would add that we needed to, first, see the answer from

Georgia and get some sense of the scope of the litigation at this point before making a final determination, and then meet with the relevant agencies and consider views of other parties before making a determination.

And I was also -- I would also say that I think this is a continuing evaluation process. And as we note, there may be changed circumstances down the road that lead us to re-evaluate this determination. But for the time being, we made the determination that our participation as amicus was sufficient to protect our interests.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, I'll
not pursue it further; but I'm troubled by the fact that it took so long for the United States to file a Statement of Intended Participation. Every day that we delay is a day that stretches out this action.

Let me ask Georgia, Florida; the parties have seven days to respond to the U.S. Statement of Intended Participation. Do you have any present intention to object to that?

MR. WINSOR: This is Allen Winsor.

No, your Honor, we do not. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. Craig Primis for Georgia.

We do intend to respond to the United States Statement of Participation.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. I think the -- my memory is that there's seven days to respond?

MR. PRIMIS: That's correct, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And I will then rule on the United States' request to remain in an amicus status.

Georgia, we have received no motion based on Rule 12(b)(2) or (5) or (b) (7) to date. Does Georgia intend to file a Rule 12(b)(7) motion for failure to join the U.S. as a necessary party; or if you're not prepared to answer that question at this stage, I'll understand.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we -- based on the submission that was just made yesterday and subject to further discussion with Georgia, if you're asking our present intention, $I$ can tell you that our present intention is to file a $12(b)(7)$ motion. And THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
we would do that on Monday.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Is there anything else of substance before we conclude this conference?

MR. WINSOR: Nothing from Florida, your Honor.

This is Allen Winsor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We will be scheduling additional conferences -- status conferences; but we don't intend to continue to send notices relating to the prescheduled conferences. We will send a notice of a telephone conference only if it becomes necessary to schedule an additional conference that we had not previously arranged for.

The conference call-in numbers will remain the same, so there will be no need for us to send further notices relating to prescheduled conferences. Is that all right with both Florida and Georgia?

MR. WINSOR: Yes, sir.
MS. GRANT: Yes, sir.
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SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Okay. One minor, little nitpicking thing. Please remember to serve three copies of filings with the special master. I received only one copy of a recent certificate of service. So in the future, please remember we want three copies here.

Now --
MR. WINSOR: Yes, sir.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Now, a couple of other things before I finish. In the United States Statement of Participation, there is a suggestion that the United States has great experience in and would be willing to initiate mediation in this matter. Let me respond by saying that my experience -- my personal experience, both as a mediator and as a party to mediation, is that it's a waste of time unless the parties are seriously interested in trying to settle this matter. And from everything $I$ have seen so far, $I$ don't see that inclination.

However, if I'm wrong, I would suggest that the parties get together with the United States because it does have extensive
experience in mediation. I'm not going to ask the parties at this point whether they're interested or not. I think they're not, but I'm not going to ask them to respond. But $I$ do urge you, again, if there is any possibility of adjusting this matter, to contact the United States representative -- I take it that, in the first instance at least, would be Mr. Gray -- and initiate that kind of mediation.

Let me say finally that, as I listen to the discussion about millions of pages of documents, the difficulty of discovery, the fact that there is -- despite the best efforts of counsel to be cooperative, there are literally areas that go back to 1976. I am not very good at predicting things; but at the risk of -- at the risk of prognosticating wrong, let me say that $I$ think that when this matter is concluded -- and I hope I live long enough to see it happen -- when this matter is concluded, at least one and probably both of the parties will be unhappy with the Court's Order. I don't know and I don't intend to at this stage try to delve into the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
depths -- and forgive that; that's not intended as a pun -- the depths of the morass that is being explored here. But I can tell you that $I$ can see an Order which requires Georgia to produce a certain volume of water or an Order that says that Florida has to get along with what it's got. And $I$ can see also that in either of those cases, the Court will be predicting weather reports because no one knows whether we're -- considering what the bizarre weather across this nation has been in the last year and a half, there is no way that anyone is going to know what is going to happen in the future.

I, again, urge you to consider the fact that before this case is over -- if it continues in its present order, before this case is over, both states will have spent millions and perhaps even billions of dollars to obtain a result which neither one wants.

Again, $I$ have told you before, you're going to get this pitch from me each time we talk. But $I$ urge you, again, to explore the possibility of settlement drafting an order that would -- or drafting an agreement that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

```
would result in a solution that meets your
present needs with an escape clause. I'm not
going to try to do that for you; but I am
going to continue to encourage you to explore
it.
    Anything further from Georgia?
    MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.
    SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything
further from Florida?
    MR. WINSOR: No, your Honor.
    We very much appreciate the special
master's time.
    SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything from
Mr. Gray?
    MR. GRAY: No, your Honor.
    SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you,
counsel. We are adjourned.
    (The telephone conference was concluded
        at 10:39 a.m.)
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