Florida v. Georgia

	3
	1 <u>PROCEEDINGS</u>
1	2 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning,
	3 counsel.
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES No. 142, Original	4 As I indicated before, it's not
STATE OF FLORIDA,)	5 necessary to rise unless you are tired of
Plaintiff,)	6 sitting. So from now on, please, it's not
V. <u>VOLUME I</u>	7 about me. It's about water.
STATE OF GEORGIA	8 Counsel, appearances?
Defendants.)	9 MR. PERRY: Good morning, your Honor.
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	10 Phil Perry for Florida. And I would like to
The above-entitled matter came on for HEARING before SPECIAL MASTER RALPH I. LANCASTER, held in the	11 introduce the other counsel at counsel's
U. S. Bankruptcy Court, at 537 Congress Street,	12 table, if I might.
Portland, Maine, on October 31, 2016, commencing at	13 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
9:09 a.m., before Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR, a	14 MR. PERRY: Jamie Wine.
Notary Public in and for the State of Maine.	15 MS. WINE: Good morning, your Honor.
For the State of Florida: PHILIP J. PERRY, ESQ.	16 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
JAMIE L. WINE, ESQ. Abid R. Qureshi, ESQ. FREDERICK L. ASCHAUER, ESQ.	17 MR. PERRY: Abid Qureshi.
PAUL N. SINGARELLA, ESQ. CHRISTOPHER J. FAWAL, ESQ.	18 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
For the State of Georgia: CRAIG S. PRIMIS, ESQ.	19 MR. QURESHI: Good morning, your Honor.
DEVORA W. ALLON, ESQ. K. WINN ALLEN, ESQ. KAREN MCCARTAN DESANTIS, ESQ.	20 MR. PERRY: And Fred Aschauer.
BARACK S. ECHOLS, ESQ.	21 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
For the U.S.A.: MICHAEL T. GRAY, ESQ.	22 MR. ASCHAUER: Good morning, your Honor.
Also Present: JOSHUA D. DUNLAP, ESQ. THE REPORTING GROUP	23 MR. PERRY: And there are two other
Mason & Lockhart	24 counsel that I would like to introduce now,
	25 if I might.
	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart
2 INDEX	4
<u>Witness</u> <u>Direct Cross</u> <u>Redirect</u> <u>Recross</u>	1 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
Withess Direct cross Redirect Recross	2 MR. PERRY: Paul Singarella, who is in
Jonathan P. Steverson 105	3 the gallery.
Napoleon Caldwell 108	4 MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your
(Video)	5 Honor.
Theodore S. Hoehn 117 118 218	6 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
	7 MR. PERRY: And Chris Fawal.
	8 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
EXHIBITS Number Page Referenced	9 MR. FAWAL: Good morning, your Honor.
JX-21 114 JX-69 37, 115	10 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, with the Court's
JX-109 151 JX-154 39	11 permission, if I might introduce a couple of
JX-161 114	12 the other attendees from the State of
JX-168 146,194	13 Florida.
FX-4 33, 111	14 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
FX-10 34	15 MR. PERRY: The secretary of Florida's
FX-16 112 FX-18 111	16 Department of Environmental Protection,
FX-24 18,108 FX-36 115	17 Secretary Steverson.
FX-46 35	18 MR. STEVERSON: Good morning, your
FX-49b 38 FX-49d1 36	19 Honor.
FX-65 110 FX-66 113	20 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
FX-85 114	21 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Florida
FX-109 111 FX-259 110	22 Solicitor General, Amit Agarway.
	23 MR. AGARWAY: Good morning, your Honor.
GX-72 119, 226	24 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
GX-91 170	25 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the Mayor of the
THE REPORTING GROUP	THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason & Lockhart	Mason & Lockhart

The Reporting Group (207) 797-6040

	TRIAL - OCIODEI	• ., <u>-</u> .	
	5		
1	Town of Apalachicola, Florida, Mr. Van	1	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
2	Johnson.	2	MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.
3	MR. JOHNSON: Good morning.	3	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may
4	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	4	proceed.
5	MR. PERRY: And the city attorney for	5	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're going to
6	Apalachicola, Mr. Pat Floyd.	6	set up just a few demonstratives for the
7	MR. FLOYD: Good morning, your Honor.	7	opening statement, if we may.
8	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	8	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: While that's
9	MR. PERRY: The executive director of	9	occurring, there was going to be a joint
	the Northwest Florida Management Water	_	exhibit offered, the designations?
10	-	10	· •
11	District, Mr. Cyphers.	11	MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. There are
12	MR. CYPHERS: Good morning, your Honor.	12	quite a few designations, and I think it will
13	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	13	take us a bit of time to cooperate to prepare
14	MR. PERRY: And I have already	14	a joint exhibit of all the designations.
15	introduced the general counsel of the	15	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Fine.
16	Department of Environmental Protection,	16	MR. PERRY: And we're also going to have
17	Mr. Aschauer.	17	a projection screen here for the opening. I
18	MR. ASCHAUER: Good morning, again, your	18	anticipate it will be about 50 minutes, your
19	Honor.	19	Honor.
20	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning,	20	I believe I'm now ready, your Honor.
21	again.	21	MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, may I come
21	MR. PERRY: Thank you.	21	around and take a look?
	-		
23	MR. PRIMIS: Good morning, your Honor.	23	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
24	Craig Primis from Kirkland & Ellis for the	24	MR. PERRY: May I proceed?
25	State of Georgia.	25	Thank you, your Honor.
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	6		8
1	6 I would like to introduce four of my	1	8 In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of
1 2	-	1 2	
	I would like to introduce four of my	-	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of
2	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be	2	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact
2 3	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with	2	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a
2 3 4	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon.	2	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he
2 3 4 5 6	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good	2 3 4 5 6	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical
2 3 4 5 6 7	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. PRIMIS: Good morning, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. PRIMIS: Good morning, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DESANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal. MR. TEAGUE: Good morning, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court. Today, of course, Georgia's position is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal. MR. TEAGUE: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court. Today, of course, Georgia's position is very different. There is no equitable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal. MR. TEAGUE: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And we have the Solicitor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court. Today, of course, Georgia's position is very different. There is no equitable apportionment to be had. And, in fact, their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal. MR. TEAGUE: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And we have the Solicitor General of Georgia here, Britt Grant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court. Today, of course, Georgia's position is very different. There is no equitable apportionment to be had. And, in fact, their position is that the harms that the States
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal. MR. TEAGUE: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And we have the Solicitor General of Georgia here, Britt Grant. MS. GRANT: Good morning, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court. Today, of course, Georgia's position is very different. There is no equitable apportionment to be had. And, in fact, their position is that the harms that the States have been discussing for 20 years do not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I would like to introduce four of my colleagues from Kirkland & Ellis who will be appearing in court and trying this case with me. I have Devora Allon. MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: I have Winn Allen. MR. ALLEN: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: Karen DeSantis. MS. DeSANTIS: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And Barack Echols. MR. ECHOLS: Good morning, your Honor. MR. PRIMIS: And with us as well today we have two representatives from the State of Georgia. I would like to introduce Ryan Teague. He is executive counsel to Governor Deal. MR. TEAGUE: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. PRIMIS: And we have the Solicitor General of Georgia here, Britt Grant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	In 1998 then Governor Zell Miller of Georgia said during the context of Compact negotiations with Florida that Florida had a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay. And then he also said in 1998 that based on technical data developed over seven years, Georgia can allocate the waters, along with Alabama and Florida, of the three major river systems, the Flint, the Chattahoochee, and the Apalachicola, in a manner that is fair and equitable to all concerned. 1998. In 2002, your Honor, in a federal court filing in a different case involving the Army Corps, while Governor Barnes was presiding in Georgia, the State of Georgia said, Florida will be entitled to its equitable apportionment of waters flowing from Georgia and could file an equitable apportionment case in the Supreme Court. Today, of course, Georgia's position is very different. There is no equitable apportionment to be had. And, in fact, their position is that the harms that the States

	9		11
1	exist. They're based on speculation; and	1	Lake Seminole. In that part of the Flint,
2	they were caused by other factors, none of	2	the Lower Flint Basin, and throughout the
3	which are attributable to Georgia.	3	Lower Flint Basin there is an intense amount
4	So, your Honor, Georgia's position in	4	of agricultural irrigation. Center pivots
5	this case after 20 years of negotiation is	5	are shown there by the circles. Not all
6	essentially that Florida's harms are	6	farmers irrigate; 50 percent do not. But the
7	imaginary and that Georgia has zero	7	amount of irrigation there is profound. And
8	responsibility.	8	that has happened since the 1970's.
9	Well, your Honor, in the next two, two	9	This is the chart, your Honor, of the
	and a half weeks, our trial presentation will	10	
10	•		growth in irrigation since the 1970's.
11	focus on three specific questions. What has	11	And here, as will be the case throughout
12	happened in the ACF Basin since the 1970's?	12	our presentation at trial, we have internal
13	Why did it happen? And what can be done in	13	documents from the State of Georgia among
14	an equitable apportionment action to fix it?	14	state employees that describe exactly what's
15	So I would like to start with that first	15	happened over time. And what they say,
16	question, what has happened. And here, you	16	without any ambiguity, is that when thousands
17	see, your Honor, a chart that shows very	17	of irrigation systems are all operating
18	starkly what happened with Georgia's	18	during dry weather, you can see a significant
19	consumption. This will be in the prefiled	19	reduction in Flint River flows. This will
20	direct of Dr. Hornberger and our other	20	occur in documents we see in this case over
21	experts. But from 1960 to 1970 to the	21	and over again from the 1990's to the present
22	present day upstream consumption of water has	22	day.
23	exploded in Georgia. The chart here, as our	23	And to put this in further perspective,
24	experts will explain, shows very high	24	in a drought year and this is a document
25	consumption levels in drought years that's	25	from 2002 written by the former director of
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	25	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	10		12
1	what those peaks there are in the chart. But	1	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division.
1 2		1 2	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in
	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the		Georgia's Environmental Protection Division.
2	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very	2	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in
2 3	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the	2 3	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than
2 3 4	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the	2 3 4	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta.
2 3 4 5	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened.	2 3 4 5	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's
2 3 4 5 6	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where	2 3 4 5 6	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing.
2 3 4 5 6 7	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro	2 3 4 5 6 7	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you can see on the screen, there is intensive 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit over here, this demonstrative, this is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you can see on the screen, there is intensive 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit over here, this demonstrative, this is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you can see on the screen, there is intensive irrigation. You can see there from a very 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit over here, this demonstrative, this is a depiction of the Apalachicola River. And The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you can see on the screen, there is intensive irrigation. You can see there from a very specific part of the Spring Creek Basin in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit over here, this demonstrative, this is a depiction of the Apalachicola River. And The Chattahoochee Gage is at the far northern
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you can see on the screen, there is intensive irrigation. You can see there from a very specific part of the Spring Creek Basin in Georgia which I will show you on the chart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit over here, this demonstrative, this is a depiction of the Apalachicola River. And The Chattahoochee Gage is at the far northern end. And it measures flows from Georgia.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what those peaks there are in the chart. But even in nondrought years, consumption is very significantly higher than it ever was in the past. So that's the first answer to the question of what has happened. We'll focus on three particular areas in the Georgia part of the basin where consumption has been intense. First, Metro Atlanta. And there, of course, the population has grown dramatically since the 1970's; and it's anticipated to continue to grow at dramatic rates before 2050, your Honor. In the Flint there are two basins. The Upper Flint is one of them. And there the water crossing the fall line in the Flint River, the Upper Flint portion of the river, has suffered a 70 percent decline since the 1970's. And in the Lower Flint, your Honor, you can see on the screen, there is intensive irrigation. You can see there from a very specific part of the Spring Creek Basin in Georgia which I will show you on the chart here is here, just in the middle going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. In a drought year, a few thousand farmers in the Flint Basin will consume more water than 6 or 7 million people in Metro Atlanta. So, your Honor, the effects of Georgia's upstream water use are unambiguous. And they will be clear, and they will be convincing. But more than that, they can be readily measured. Now, on the screen and also beside me I have got gage readings from the U.S. Geological Survey. It's a federal government entity. This is just objective data. And this particular demonstrative just to my left here is a picture of the entire historical record for what's called The Chattahoochee Gage. It's a little confusing. It's near Chattahoochee, Florida; but it's on the northern end of the Apalachicola River. So if I might step over to this exhibit over here, this demonstrative, this is a depiction of the Apalachicola River. And The Chattahoochee Gage is at the far northern end. And it measures flows from Georgia. So here to my immediate left is a

1 picture of what the historical record of 2 2 flows look like. And, your Honor, I would 2 3 suggest that this particular printout from 4 4 that gage on the Apalachicola River shows an 1 5 monstakable pattern. 5 6 Now, we have filled in in yellow boxes 4 7 that are extreme low flows. Our experts 6 8 later in this case will describe what 6 9 those what those extreme low flows are and 9 10 were droughts in the 1930's, as you can see 1 11 the top of the chart, and then in the 1 12 Now, this isn't something that Georgia 13 fows, in other words, the average flow per 14 the top on the soft, would main monthly low 15 fors. 16 fors. 17 but when you get to the last 15 years, although 16 fors. 17 the droughts are thready as bad in the last 18 thed roughts wouldn't be nearof <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>01, 20</th><th></th></t<>			01, 20	
2 flows look like. And, your Honor, I would 2 dramatically higher than 2011. The same is 3 suggest that this particular printout from it we with 2012. And if you do that 4 true with 2012. And if you do that 5 unmistakable pattern. ormparison for 1931 and compare it to recent 6 Now, we have filled in in yellow boxes for draghts, you see the same thing. The 7 that are extreme low flows, our experts for draghts, you see the same thing. The 8 this case will describe what for draghts, you see the same thing. The 10 why they're relevant. But although there for draghts, in some thing that Georgia 12 ather in the sistory of the basin, you had only a for 13 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and 155 doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize 14 for doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize 14 for doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize 14 for doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize 14 for doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize doesn't reco		13		15
3 suggest that this particular printout from 4 that gage on the Apalachicola River shows an 5 true with 2012. And if you do that 4 4 that agge on the Apalachicola River shows an a comparison for 1931 and compare it to recent 5 6 Now, we have filled in in yellow boxes for aparison for 1931 and compare it to recent 5 7 that are extreme low flow flows. Our experts flows are nuch, much hower today. 6 8 tart in this case will describe what flows are nuch, much hower today. 6 13 tota of the chart, and then in the flows are nuch, much hower today. 6 13 tota of the chart, and then in the flows are nuch, much hower today. 6 14 in the history of the basin, you had only a flows are nuch, much hower today. 6 14 flows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, flows are reached 15 fwo arcs and wer and over and flows are reached flows are reached 2 are a few more flows below 6,000 CS. But flows are reached sooner and are lower than before inrigation 2 flow	1	picture of what the historical record of	1	2011. And, yet, the flows in 1954 were
4 that gage on the Apalachicola River shows an a unmistakable pattern. 4 comparison for 1931 and compare it to recent 5 unmistakable pattern. 6 droughts, you see the same thing. The 6 droughts in the past were worse, but our 7 7 thats case will describe what 6 8 this case will describe what 6 9 those what those extreme low flows are and 7 10 why they're relevant. But albrough there 9 11 were droughts in the 1930's, as you can see 1 12 athe top of the chart, and then in the 1 13 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and 155 1 14 that is sin the some now is 1 15 few occasions where you had mean monthi (how 16 16 for so, you det to the ear of 1 1 17 month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, 1 4 14 that genolal Water planning document 1 14 that genolal Water planning document 1 14 that g	2	flows look like. And, your Honor, I would	2	dramatically higher than 2011. The same is
4 that gage on the Apalachicola River shows an a unmistakable pattern. 4 comparison for 1931 and compare it to recent 5 unmistakable pattern. 6 droughts, you see the same thing. The 6 droughts in the past were worse, but our 7 7 thats case will describe what 6 8 this case will describe what 6 9 those what those extreme low flows are and 7 10 why they're relevant. But albrough there 9 11 were droughts in the 1930's, as you can see 1 12 athe top of the chart, and then in the 1 13 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and 155 1 14 that is sin the some now is 1 15 few occasions where you had mean monthi (how 16 16 for so, you det to the ear of 1 1 17 month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, 1 4 14 that genolal Water planning document 1 14 that genolal Water planning document 1 14 that g	3	suggest that this particular printout from	3	true with 2012. And if you do that
s unmistakable pattern. 5 droughts, you see the same thing. The 6 Mow, we have filled in in yellow boxes f 7 that are extreme low flows. Our experts f 8 later in this case will describe what 6 9 basin. Fundamental change in the hydrology of the 9 basin. 10 10 why they're relevant. But although there 11 11 basin. 10 12 atte to p of the chart, and then in the 13 13 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and 'S5 14 14 the history of the basin, you had man monthy low 16 16 fows, in other words, the average flow per 12 17 month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, 14 18 But when you get to the last 15 years, although 14 19 But when you get to the last 5, you get a 15 10 the droughts and 'S, you get a 3 10 the droughts and 'S, you get a 14 14 the droughts and 'S, you get a 14	4		4	
 Now, we have filled in in yellow boxes that are extreme low flows. Our experts later in this case will describe what those what those extreme low flows are and where droughts in the 1930's, as you can see at the top of the chart, and then in the 1950's with the worst but although there were droughts in the 1930's, as you can see at the top of the chart, and then in the 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and '55 in the history of the basin, you had only a few occasions where you had mean monthly low for flows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, furgation, things changed dramatically, your Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the 1980's here. There are a rea more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the 1980's here. There are a rea frew more flows below 6,000 cfs. But the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get to the selow flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. The is ha pappend. Your Honor, Spring Creek when ta has abpenden. Your Honor, Spring Creek what has happend in 2011. This s all to jurties sorem. So they're expanded a bis you a canse what the numbers actually are. a soreme shows what happend in 2011. This sall bojective a that some of these acting a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the sorem shows that were averaging 300 cfs in a what happend in 2011. This sall bojective a what happend in 2011. This sall bojective a what				
1 that are extreme low flows. Our experts 7 flows are much, much lower today. 8 later in this case will describe what 7 flows are much, much lower today. 9 those what those extreme low flows are and 7 flows are much, much lower today. 10 why they're relevant. But although there 7 flows are much, much lower today. 11 that the top of the chart, and then in the 13 13 13 1550's with the worst drought in 1954 and 5's 14 that this is happening. This is an important 15 few occasions where you had mean monthly low 14 that this is happening. This is an important 16 discus, in other words, the average flow per 10 2006 plan. It relates to the Flint River, 18 discus, in other words, banged dramatically, your 14 14 14 19 but when you get to the last 15 years, although 23 sooner and are lower than before irrigation 21 the droughts airdin the hydrology of the 14 16 14 16 1 these low flows over and over and over again. 24 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16		•		
 a later in this case will describe what b later in this case will describe what b loss what those extreme low flows are and whet hey're relevant. But although there wher droughts in the 1930's, as you can see at the top of the chart, and then in the b loss of the basin, you had only a f ew occasions where you had mean monthly low f fows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, f cfs. but when you get to the era of but when you get to the era of but when you get to the lasd 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last f these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and 'S, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in so what the numbers actually are. So what the numbers actually are in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded ab tis you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate moths where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and the serve. Use a can see what the numbers actually are. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 than there were in 2011. This is all objective data, your Hoonr. There was less there were fiver inches of preipitation in the so this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective the stime as inrigation in 1954 than there were in 2011. There the stime as inrigation in the so t		-		
 those what those extreme low flows are and twy they're relevant. But although there in the 1930's, asy ou can see the inter of outputs in the 1930's, asy ou can see into the sort, and then in the 13 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and 155 in the store of impact of the sort, the average flow per industry of the basin, you had only a industry and the store of impact of the sort, the average flow per industry of the sort, you get to the rate of impact industry of the sort, the sort industry of the sort, the sort industry of the sort industry in 2012, eight months. So these results are shown here on the sorcen. So they're expanded a bit so you is core industry in 2012, eight months. To the sort and wer averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred in form flows that were averaging 300 cfs in sort was 2 cfs, 3; and then in in 20 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used in the basin. So this particular chart now on the sorces nows what happened in 1911. This is all objective 2 data, your Honor. There was less there were inches of precipitation in the 2 screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective 2 data, your Honor. There were let in 1954 than there were in 2011. There were inches of precipitation in the 2 screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective 2 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There is all objective 2 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There is all objective 2 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There is all objective 2 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There is all objective 2 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 2011. There is all objective 2 basin in 1954 than		•		· · · · ·
 why they're relevant. But although there where droughts in the 1930's, as you can see at the top of the chart, and then in the 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and '55 the his or the order and over and ver the ever than before irrigation. by when you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the 1980's here. There the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 14 these low flows over and over and over again. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek there there basin. So this particular chart how on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and 1954 and 194 and 194 are streamflow declines. And this is not just the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone form flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred the middle the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the sco this particular chart now on the were winches of precipitation in the what happened in 2011. This is all objective what happened in 2011. There were sco t	8		8	
 were droughts in the 1930's, as you can see the wore droughts in the 1930's, as you can see the the chart, and then in the 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and '55 in the history of the basin, you had only a few occasions where you had mean monthy low fow, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, fs. But when you get to the era of irrigation, things changed dramatically, your But when you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low grad a screen. So they're expanded a bits oyou can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek the ast 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in a that happened in 2011. This is all objective were fewer inches of precipitation in the were fewerinches of precipitation in the wer	9	those what those extreme low flows are and	9	basin.
12 at the top of the chart, and then in the 13 13 13 1350's with the worst drought in 1954 and only a 13 13 1550's with the worst drought in 1954 and only a 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 14 15 14 16 14 16 14 16 14 16 14 16 15 15 15 15 15 16 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	10	why they're relevant. But although there	10	That is what is on the screen now is
 13 1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and '55 14 in the history of the basin, you had only a 15 few occasions where you had mean monthy low 16 flows, in other words, the average flow per 17 month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, 18 att when you get to the era of 19 But when you get to the era of 11 Honor. So you get to the 1980's you 21 says that drought arently as had pened in 1954 and in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get 14 the selow flows over and over angain. 25 these results are shown here on the 36 othese results are shown here on the 37 So these results are shown here on the 38 othese results are shown here on the 39 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 att has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 14 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 30 othis particular chart now on the 31 So where inches of precipitation in the 32 that appened in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 33 the flows wore 100 cf s- cubic feet per second. 34 that extensive pumping has cuckly are. 35 othis particular chart now on the 36 othis particular chart now on the 30 othis particular chart now on the 310 othis particu	11	were droughts in the 1930's, as you can see	11	1931.
 in the history of the basin, you had only a in the history of the basin, you had only a in the history of the basin, you had only a if ew occasions where you had mean monthly low flows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, cfs. But when you get to the era of irrigation, things changed dramatically, your Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last to years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart Mason & Lockhart these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. To But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek what happened in 2011. This is all objective wat happened in 2011. This is all objective wat happened in 2011. This is all objective wat happened in 2011. This is all objective ware fewer inches of precipitation in the a ware fewer inches of precipitation in the a ware fewer inches of precipitation in the a ware first time as irrigation became 	12	at the top of the chart, and then in the	12	Now, this isn't something that Georgia
 in the history of the basin, you had only a in the history of the basin, you had only a in the history of the basin, you had only a if ew occasions where you had mean monthly low flows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, cfs. But when you get to the era of irrigation, things changed dramatically, your Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last to years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart Mason & Lockhart these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. To But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek what happened in 2011. This is all objective wat happened in 2011. This is all objective wat happened in 2011. This is all objective wat happened in 2011. This is all objective ware fewer inches of precipitation in the a ware fewer inches of precipitation in the a ware fewer inches of precipitation in the a ware first time as irrigation became 	13	1950's with the worst drought in 1954 and '55	13	doesn't recognize. Georgia does recognize
 fe woccasions where you had mean monthly low if flows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if case. It's Joint Exhibit 21. We call it the if if it's and it's a Regional Water planing document if it's any it's unambiguous. It is any set case it is say are a dewer than before irrigation is 2006. And also, 22 that agricultural irrigation compounds the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 14 14 14 16 16 these low flows over and over angain. 2 27 the forught. In other words, in effects of climatic drought. In other words, in the sase in 1954 and '5, you get a so these results are shown here on the sorter. So they're expanded a bit so you get the forught as in the sase as any should it be nearly as bad and it's Acte Rasin. 28 but that's not the only the		-	14	
 16 flows, in other words, the average flow per month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, cfs. 17 month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, cfs. 18 dit's a Regional Water planning document 19 But when you get to the era of irrigation, things changed dramatically, your 21 Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There 2 are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But 2 are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But 2 ares as they were in the 1950's, you get 3 to years as they were in the 1950's, you get 3 to years as they were in the 1950's, you get 3 couple months of those record low flows, in 4 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 14 these low flows over and over and over again. 2 So where you see in 1954 and 'S, you get a 3 couple months of those record low flows, in 4 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 5 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 this ACF Basin. 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 12011, four months in a row was zero. Used 14 the entire basin. 10 So this particular chart now on the 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 15 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 2 data, your Honor. There was less there 2 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 2 data, your Honor. There was less there 2 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 2 data, your Honor. There was less there 2 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 2 data, your Honor. There was less there 2 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 2 data, your Honor. There was less there 2 more in 2011. This is all objective 2 data, your Honor. There was less there 2 more in 2011. This is all objective 2 data, your Honor. There was less th				
 month, was under 6,000 cubic feet per second, cfs. But when you get to the era of irrigation, things changed dramatically, your Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart these low flows over and over angain. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six month; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you a sut that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek there in the middle of the ACF Basin, has goen from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in for flows that were averaging 300 cfs in so this particular chart now on the so this				
18 cfs. 13 and it's a Regional Water planning document 19 But when you get to the era of 14 that Georgia created through its 20 irrigation, things changed dramatically, your 15 that Georgia created through its 21 Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There 23 says and it's plain; it's unambiguous. It 22 says that drought year low flows are reached 24 says that drought year low flows are reached 23 the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 14 the agricultural irrigation compounds the 24 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 16 1 these low flows over and over and over again. 24 became widespread. This is 2006. And also, 25 So where you see in 1954 and 's, you get a 3 couple months, in 2012, eight months. 3 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 the droughts wouldn't be nearly as bad and 4 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 5 5 5 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 that extensive pumping thas caused significant 9 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 So there are many s				
 But when you get to the era of irrigation, things changed dramatically, your Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get The REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 14 these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. To batt are results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were form flows that were averaging 300 cfs in So this particular chart now on the So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the were fewer inches of				•
 irrigation, things changed dramatically, your Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in a couple months of those record low flows, in b this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you a sumer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred there in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone form flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were form flows that were averaging 300 cfs in so this particular chart now on the so this particular chart now o	18		18	
 Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 14 these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were form flows that were averaging 300 cfs in So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There ware in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There ware in 2011. There 	19		19	that Georgia created through its
 are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But when you get to the last 15 years, although the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 14 these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the were fewer inches of precipitation in the were fewer inches of precipitation in the the first time as irrigation became 	20	irrigation, things changed dramatically, your	20	Environmental Protection Division. What it
 23 when you get to the last 15 years, although 24 the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 25 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 26 these low flows over and over and over again. 27 So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a 3 couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 5 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 this ACF Basin. 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 sooner and are lower than before irrigation became 23 sooner and are lower than before irrigation became 23 sooner and are lower than before irrigation became 	21	Honor. So you get to the 1980's here. There	21	says and it's plain; it's unambiguous. It
 the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate there in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows the antire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there ware fewer inches of precipitation in the ware fewer inches of precipitation in the ware fewer inches of precipitation in the the solution in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 	22	are a few more flows below 6,000 cfs. But	22	says that drought year low flows are reached
 the droughts aren't nearly as bad in the last 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart these low flows over and over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate there in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows the antire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there ware fewer inches of precipitation in the ware fewer inches of precipitation in the ware fewer inches of precipitation in the the solution in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 	23	when you get to the last 15 years, although	23	sooner and are lower than before irrigation
 25 15 years as they were in the 1950's, you get THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 26 that agricultural irrigation compounds the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 27 14 1 28 that agricultural irrigation compounds the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 29 that agricultural irrigation compounds the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 20 11 these low flows over and over again. 20 20 11, six months; in 2012, eight months. 30 these results are shown here on the 3 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 31 can see what the numbers actually are. 32 But that's not the only way to evaluate 31 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 31 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 32 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 32 So this particular chart now on the 32 So this particular chart now on the 33 So this particular chart now on the 34 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 34 wat happened in 2011. This is all objective 34 wat happened in 2011. This is all objective 34 wat happened in 2011. There 35 on 1951, Radium Springs went dry for 34 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 35 on 1951, Radium Springs went dry for 35 on 1951, Radium Springs went dry for 36 this particular chart one in 2011. There 37 So the se recent and the se irrigation became 	24		24	-
THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & LockhartTHE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart1414161these low flows over and over again. 21effects of climatic drought. In other words, 22So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a 3 couple months of those record low flows, in 41effects of climatic drought. In other words, 23couple months of those record low flows, in 42011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 51effects of climatic drought. In other words, 242011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 55So there are many scholars, including 6the droughts wouldn't be nearly as low without 47So these results are shown here on the 8So these results are shown here on the 8So these results are shown here on the 9So these results are shown here on the 910But that's not the only way to evaluate 11what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 141611what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 14summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 151015beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 172011, four months in a row was zero. Used 161119So this particular chart now on the 20screen shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective 2210particular chart now on the 				-
Mason & LockhartMason & Lockhart1414161these low flows over and over again.12So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a13couple months of those record low flows, in142011, six months; in 2012, eight months.15This is a profound change in the hydrology of56this ACF Basin.57So these results are shown here on the58screen. So they're expanded a bit so you59can see what the numbers actually are.610But that's not the only way to evaluate1011what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek1012here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone1313from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in1414So this particular chart now on the1515beginning in the last 15 years. There were1616months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in1217So this particular chart now on the1318So this particular chart now on the1420what happened in 2011. This is all objective2424the resonable year. That's a lot of water.25were fewer inches of precipitation in the2426basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There2424basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There24	20		20	
14161these low flows over and over and over again.1effects of climatic drought. In other words,2So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a1effects of climatic drought. In other words,3couple months of those record low flows, in1the droughts wouldn't be nearly as bad and42011, six months; in 2012, eight months.5the droughts wouldn't be nearly as bad and5This is a profound change in the hydrology of6the flows wouldn't be nearly as low without6this ACF Basin.5So there are many scholars, including7So these results are shown here on the5So there are many scholars, including8screen. So they're expanded a bit so you6throughout different parts of Georgia, who9can see what the numbers actually are.10But that's not the only way to evaluate10But that's not the only way to evaluate10pumping from rivers. This is pumping from11what has papened. Your Honor, Spring Creek10pumping from rivers. This is pumping from13from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in10of that, some of these aquifers the Upper14summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred15of that, some of these aquifers the Upper16beginning in the last 15 years. There were16it's relatively shallow. But they provide172011, four months in a row was zero. Used16it's relatively shallow. But they provide18the entire basin.19so this part				
 these low flows over and over again. So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a couple months of those record low flows, in 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There the sin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There the floridan Aguifer second. the solution of the second. the floridan Aguifer is a lot of water. This is all objective the floridan Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day. And in preasonable year. That's a lot of water. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 				
 2 So where you see in 1954 and '5, you get a 3 couple months of those record low flows, in 4 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 5 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 this ACF Basin. 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 he droughts wouldn't be nearly as bad and 3 the flows wouldn't be nearly as low without 4 irrigation. 5 So there are many scholars, including 6 throughout different parts of Georgia, who 7 have looked at this issue; and they agree 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 streamflow declines. And this is not just 10 pumping from rivers. This is pumping from 11 aquifers below the ground groundwater. 12 So just to provide a particular example 13 of that, some of these aquifers the Upper 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 19 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 20 that papened in 2011. This is all objective 21 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 				
 3 couple months of those record low flows, in 4 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. 5 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 this ACF Basin. 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 3 the flows wouldn't be nearly as low without 3 the flows wouldn't be nearly as low without 4 irrigation. 5 So there are many scholars, including 6 throughout different parts of Georgia, who 7 have looked at this issue; and they agree 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 streamflow declines. And this is not just 10 pumping from rivers. This is pumping from 11 aquifers below the ground groundwater. 12 So just to provide a particular example 13 of that, some of these aquifers the Upper 14 some of these aduifers the Upper 15 relatively shallow. But they provide 16 the entire basin. 18 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 19 feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day	1	5	1	
 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 4 irrigation. So this particular chart now on the So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became 	2		2	-
 5 This is a profound change in the hydrology of 6 this ACF Basin. 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 5 So there are many scholars, including 5 Co there are many scholars, including 6 throughout different parts of Georgia, who 7 have looked at this issue; and they agree 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 streamflow declines. And this is not just 10 pumping from rivers. This is pumping from 11 aquifers below the ground groundwater. 12 So just to provide a particular example 13 of that, some of these aquifers the Upper 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 relatively shallow. But they provide 16 three easies. 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 23 So in 1981, Radium Springs wen	-	couple months of those record low flows in	3	the flows wouldn't be nearly as low without
 6 this ACF Basin. 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 6 throughout different parts of Georgia, who 7 have looked at this issue; and they agree 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 streamflow declines. And this is not just 10 pumping from rivers. This is pumping from 11 aquifers below the ground groundwater. 12 So just to provide a particular example 13 of that, some of these aquifers the Upper 14 Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal 15 aquifer. It's the easiest to access because 16 it's relatively shallow. But they provide 17 tens of millions of gallons per day. And in 18 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 19 feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 23 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 	3	couple months of those record low nows, in	-	the nows wouldn't be nearly as low without
 7 So these results are shown here on the 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 7 have looked at this issue; and they agree 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 suppring from rivers. This is pumping from 10 aquifers below the ground groundwater. 12 So just to provide a particular example 13 of that, some of these aquifers the Upper 14 Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal 15 aquifer. It's the easiest to access because 16 it's relatively shallow. But they provide 17 tens of millions of gallons per day. And in 18 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 19 feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 23 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 		-		-
 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 10 So this particular chart now on the 11 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 state at the summer and the summer and the summer at the summer and the summer and the summer at the sum	4	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months.	4	irrigation.
 8 screen. So they're expanded a bit so you 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 10 So this particular chart now on the 11 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 8 that extensive pumping has caused significant 9 state at the summer and the summer and the summer at the summer and the summer and the summer at the sum	4 5	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of	4 5	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including
 9 can see what the numbers actually are. 10 But that's not the only way to evaluate 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 9 streamflow declines. And this is not just 9 sumping from rivers. This is pumping from 11 aquifers below the ground groundwater. 12 So just to provide a particular example 13 of that, some of these aquifers the Upper 14 Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal 15 aquifer. It's the easiest to access because 16 it's relatively shallow. But they provide 17 tens of millions of gallons per day. And in 18 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 19 feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 24 the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 6	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin.	4 5 6	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who
10But that's not the only way to evaluate10pumping from rivers. This is pumping from11what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek11aquifers below the ground groundwater.12here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone12So just to provide a particular example13from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in13of that, some of these aquifers the Upper14summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred14Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal15beginning in the last 15 years. There were16aquifer. It's the easiest to access because16months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in18the entire basin.172011, four months in a row was zero. Used18the entire basin.19So this particular chart now on the19feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone20screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows20provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a21what happened in 2011. This is all objective21reasonable year. That's a lot of water.22data, your Honor. There was less there23So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for24basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There24the first time as irrigation became	4 5 6 7	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the	4 5 6 7	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree
 11 what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek 12 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone 13 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in 14 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred 15 beginning in the last 15 years. There were 16 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 	4 5 6 7 8	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you	4 5 6 7 8	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant
 here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 	4 5 6 7 8 9	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are.	4 5 6 7 8 9	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just
 from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There of that, some of these aquifers the Upper of that, some of these aquifers the Upper floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate	4 5 7 8 9 10	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from
 summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater.
 beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the beginning in the last 15 years. There were in 2011. There aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example
 months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There it's relatively shallow. But they provide it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper
 17 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used 18 the entire basin. 19 So this particular chart now on the 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 20 this particular chart now on the 21 tens of millions of gallons per day. And in 22 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 23 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 24 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 25 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 26 particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, 27 feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone 28 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 29 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 23 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 24 the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal
 the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because
19So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows19feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a20screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows20provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a21what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there a were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There19feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a22data, your Honor. There was less there basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There23So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because
19So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows19feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a20screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows20provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a21what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there a were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There19feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a22data, your Honor. There was less there basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There23So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide
 20 screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 20 provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 23 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 24 the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in
 21 what happened in 2011. This is all objective 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 21 reasonable year. That's a lot of water. 22 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 23 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 24 the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan,
 22 data, your Honor. There was less there 23 were fewer inches of precipitation in the 24 basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There 25 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 26 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 27 That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. 28 So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for 29 the first time as irrigation became 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone
23were fewer inches of precipitation in the23So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for24basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There24the first time as irrigation became	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a
24basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There24the first time as irrigation became	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water.
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second.
25 were higher temperatures in 1954 than in 25 widespread. It goes dry all the time now in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became
	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There were higher temperatures in 1954 than in	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became widespread. It goes dry all the time now in
Mason & Lockhart Mason & Lockhart	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2011, six months; in 2012, eight months. This is a profound change in the hydrology of this ACF Basin. So these results are shown here on the screen. So they're expanded a bit so you can see what the numbers actually are. But that's not the only way to evaluate what has happened. Your Honor, Spring Creek here in the middle of the ACF Basin, has gone from flows that were averaging 300 cfs in summer months, 250 cfs, to zero that occurred beginning in the last 15 years. There were months where it was 2 cfs, 3; and then in 2011, four months in a row was zero. Used the entire basin. So this particular chart now on the screen shows what happened in 1954 and shows what happened in 2011. This is all objective data, your Honor. There was less there were fewer inches of precipitation in the basin in 1954 than there were in 2011. There were higher temperatures in 1954 than in THE REPORTING GROUP	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	irrigation. So there are many scholars, including throughout different parts of Georgia, who have looked at this issue; and they agree that extensive pumping has caused significant streamflow declines. And this is not just pumping from rivers. This is pumping from aquifers below the ground groundwater. So just to provide a particular example of that, some of these aquifers the Upper Floridan Aquifer is the name of the principal aquifer. It's the easiest to access because it's relatively shallow. But they provide tens of millions of gallons per day. And in particular one aquifer, the Upper Floridan, feeds Radium Springs, which itself alone provides 70.6 million gallons per day in a reasonable year. That's a lot of water. That's over 100 cfs cubic feet per second. So in 1981, Radium Springs went dry for the first time as irrigation became widespread. It goes dry all the time now in THE REPORTING GROUP

		1	
1	17		19
1	drought years.	1	The Bainbridge Gage is here at the
2	This is a picture of what Radium Springs	2	southern not extreme southern, but near
3	looks like in a wet year or a normal this	3	the southern end of the Flint River Basin.
4	is actually a normal year. But here is what	4	And what this chart demonstrates, your
5	it looks like in a drought year.	5	Honor, is that there's a shortfall between
6	There are irrigation center pivot wells	6	the flow of the river and the sustainability
7	drawing from groundwater all around this	7	criteria. In other words, there's not enough
8	area. And this is what happens, your Honor.	8	water in the river. And this number right
9	Never happened before 1981. With the growth	9	here, 1376, that's how many cubic feet per
10	of irrigation, it happens all the time now.	10	second the flow of the Flint River at
11	So, your Honor, this particular slide on	11	Bainbridge was short. That's a considerable
12	the screen is a depiction of the relationship	12	amount of water, your Honor.
13	between groundwater pumping and you see a	13	And while Florida believes that that
14	well there irrigating a crop and the Flint	14	actually, the way that's calculated is in
15	River. The Flint River and its tributaries	15	fact too low, that alone is a very
16	are all impacted by groundwater withdrawals.	16	significant admission in this case. 1376
17	This particular well draws from the Floridan	17	short on the Flint River under Georgia's own
18	Aquifer as depicted there.	18	sustainability requirements.
19	And Georgia studied this. They studied	19	But, your Honor, we don't just have to
20	it in some detail. There is at Florida	20	focus on Georgia's own requirements. We have
21	Exhibit 24 one of their studies called The	21	federal guidelines for the health and
22	Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan.	22	maintaining the present structure of the
23	This, I think, will be an important document	23	Apalachicola River ecosystems. And these are
24	in this case as well. It's from 2011.	24	from 1999.
25	And there Georgia, using its own data,	25	And, your Honor, if I might step over to
_	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	18		
1		1	20
1	determined that too much water was being	1	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola
2	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in	2	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from
2 3	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint	2 3	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999
2 3 4	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the	2 3 4	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire
2 3 4 5	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin.	2 3 4 5	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question
2 3 4 5 6	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the	2 3 4 5 6	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered
2 3 4 5 6 7	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be	2 3 4 5 6 7	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the Apalachicola dipped below those levels
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is particularly revealing and important. Here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the Apalachicola dipped below those levels consistently. These are one-day minimums.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is particularly revealing and important. Here at Bainbridge, this is a USGS gage at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the Apalachicola dipped below those levels consistently. These are one-day minimums. Year after year after year including in 2007,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is particularly revealing and important. Here at Bainbridge, this is a USGS gage at Bainbridge. I'll point out, your Honor, on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the Apalachicola dipped below those levels consistently. These are one-day minimums. Year after year after year including in 2007, 2008, 2011, 2012. And, your Honor, what's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is particularly revealing and important. Here at Bainbridge, this is a USGS gage at Bainbridge. I'll point out, your Honor, on the bigger map where Bainbridge is.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the Apalachicola dipped below those levels consistently. These are one-day minimums. Year after year after year including in 2007, 2008, 2011, 2012. And, your Honor, what's particularly troubling, if I might invite the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	determined that too much water was being withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint Basin. It's a relatively large area in the Flint Basin. And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be playing his with your permission, your Honor, his deposition designations by video later today. He has worked with Georgia's Environmental Protection Division for decades with responsibility for agricultural permitting and water resources. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. But that's not the only study in that particular exhibit. Today, later today, we'll be focused on this particular study as well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is particularly revealing and important. Here at Bainbridge, this is a USGS gage at Bainbridge. I'll point out, your Honor, on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	20 the chart here that shows the Apalachicola River Basin, these particular guidelines from EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 are for the ecological health of that entire river basin. That's a different question under federal law from whether endangered species will persist with low flows in particular discrete areas. This is a measurement of what's necessary to maintain the health of the entire river ecosystem. So, your Honor, if we take a look at the first column and we'll spend some time on this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. But if you take a look at the first column there, there are a number of one-day minimum flows that must be exceeded in all years. That means you should not, for the health of the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. Well, your Honor, on the next slide in yellow, over the last 15 years the Apalachicola dipped below those levels consistently. These are one-day minimums. Year after year after year including in 2007, 2008, 2011, 2012. And, your Honor, what's

		101, 2	
	21		23
1	Court's attention to 2016, we're below those	1	on Apalachicola Bay and Apalachicola River
2	levels now. We were below those levels in	2	and the ecosystems that surround them. But
3	July and August and September. Those are	3	I'll start by saying that Florida has made a
4	one-day minimum flows.	4	commitment since the 1960's to protect
5	But there are other charts in this same	5	natural areas. In fact, Secretary
6	EPA and U.S. Fish and Wildlife guidance from	6	Steverson's testimony is about that. And
7	1999 that recognize it's not just the one-day	7	this commitment was made particularly in the
8	minimum flow that matters. For the ecosystem	8	Apalachicola far before these impacts have
	-		
9	it's also very important that you don't have	9	been felt, far before irrigation exploded,
10	repeated low flows year after year after	10	far before Atlanta boomed in size.
11	year. And so this particular column that I	11	So this particular slide is Article II,
12	have highlighted is the one-day minimum	12	Section 7 of Florida's Constitution where it
13	exceeded in three or four years. In other	13	shall be the policy of the state to conserve
14	words, you should not go below that number	14	and protect natural resources and scenic
15	more than one in four years.	15	beauty. This is a public policy that Florida
16	Those are much higher numbers than we	16	pursues. Secretary Steverson's prefiled
17	have on our river. In fact, this chart, your	17	direct talks about it. And he'll be
18	Honor, shows vast noncompliance with that	18	available to talk about it in detail today.
19	guideline. There are and that's what the	19	In particular, about all of the acreage
	yellow blocks are here on the chart.		that's been set aside, purchased, to avoid
20	-	20	
21	There are a few months in 2005 and 2003	21	development and to preserve these ecosystems.
22	and 2014 and '13 that are in compliance, but	22	So there's a very specific problem
23	virtually everything else is out of	23	occurring in Apalachicola Bay. It's that the
24	compliance with those federal guidelines.	24	ecosystem, which is a unique estuary, is
25	So, your Honor, there will be multiple	25	changing. And it's changing because the
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	22		24
1		1	
1	22 discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This		river, which I'm highlighting with the
2	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This	2	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows
2 3	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean	2 3	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked
2 3 4	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important	2 3 4	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows
2 3 4 5	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of	2 3 4 5	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows.
2 3 4 5 6	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's	2 3 4 5 6	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down
2 3 4 5 6 7	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations.	2 3 4 5 6 7	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has
2 3 4 5 6 7	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last	2 3 4 5 6 7	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012. But this isn't reasonably disputed, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of predators marine predators, predators that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012. But this isn't reasonably disputed, your Honor. This is happening.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of predators marine predators, predators that live in saltwater and prey on oysters in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012. But this isn't reasonably disputed, your Honor. This is happening. Now, I would like I would like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of predators marine predators, predators that live in saltwater and prey on oysters in particular. Oysters are a foundational
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012. But this isn't reasonably disputed, your Honor. This is happening. Now, I would like I would like to turn to the actual impacts of those low flows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of predators marine predators, predators that live in saltwater and prey on oysters in particular. Oysters are a foundational species for the ecology of the bay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012. But this isn't reasonably disputed, your Honor. This is happening. Now, I would like I would like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of predators marine predators, predators that live in saltwater and prey on oysters in particular. Oysters are a foundational
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	discussions, I'm sure, with Georgia witnesses about other criteria in this case. This particular slide identifies them. The Clean Water Act requirements may be quite important as we go forward, as well as some of Georgia's own wildlife resources division's recommendations. But this particular chart that I have just focused is the chart we received last week with a bookshelf of new information from Georgia's experts. It's not in their prefiled direct. It's in the supporting material. This is a chart from Dr. Bedient, one of Georgia's experts in this case, that shows how many days of low flow Florida received on the Apalachicola River. You notice there is some in the 1930's, including 1931, which we talked about. There is some in '54 and '55. But, boy, it just explodes when you get to 2000 and goes and gets worse and worse through 2012. But this isn't reasonably disputed, your Honor. This is happening. Now, I would like I would like to turn to the actual impacts of those low flows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	river, which I'm highlighting with the pointer here, has significantly lower flows than it had in history. Of course, we talked about that with the chart here which shows the objective data on all those lower flows. But when you get lower flows coming down the Apalachicola River here, this estuary, which is a mix of fresh and saltwater and has oysters, all sorts of other very unique species that depend upon that mix, when you get less water, the bay starts to become a saltwater lagoon and not an estuary. And so at the bottom of the slide, you see the Gulf of Mexico. The salinity here, when fresh water is low, becomes much more like the Gulf of Mexico. And the species suffer. And that's a fundamental change to the ecology of the bay. So we know what's happening in the bay, your Honor. This particular photograph is of predators marine predators, predators that live in saltwater and prey on oysters in particular. Oysters are a foundational species for the ecology of the bay.

TRIAL - October 31, 2016 (Vol. I)

	TRIAL - OCIODEI	1	
	25	_	27
1	So here are a series of predators,	1	he's reached.
2	sometimes called conchs or oyster drills or	2	Based on these observations, his
3	snails. And, your Honor, here are some other	3	experiments, and mathematical modeling, the
4	pictures on cages that are that have been	4	cause of the crash of the oyster fishery in
5	pulled up by one of our experts in his	5	2012 were these low flows that we talked
6	experimentation throughout the bay. These	6	about earlier today that produced higher
7	are predators.	7	rates of disease, all the conchs and other
8	And here, your Honor, is a cage that has	8	predators we have been talking about, and
9	conch egg sacs. It's a very ugly picture in	9	then a systematic failure to reproduce in the
10	my opinion. These egg sacs each have	10	same way that the oysters should.
11	hundreds of conch eggs. And so just what you	11	So Georgia's position in this case is
12	see in this picture is potentially thousands	12	that none of these things I have identified
13	of those predators could potentially yield	13	are really the cause, and that it's all
14	that many predators.	14	fishery mismanagement by Florida,
15	So, your Honor, probably towards the end	15	overharvesting. Well, your Honor, the
16	of this week Mr. Mark Berrigan will testify.	16	federal government issued a Disaster
17	He's a 30-year veteran of the bay. He	17	Declaration when the fishery when the
18	formerly worked with the Florida Department	18	oyster fishery crashed. And the only way
19	of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Here	19	they could do that under federal statutes was
20	is how he describes what's happening.	20	if they made a finding that there was not
21	(Whereupon the video was played.)	21	fishery mismanagement as the central cause.
22	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Mr. Berrigan is	22	And, in fact, they found that the central
23	not the only person who will testify about	23	cause of the harm to oysters in the bay was
24	those personal observations. We will have in	24	indeed low flows, severe low flows.
25	the courtroom, for example, Mr. Tommy Ward,	25	So prominent in Georgia's pretrial brief
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	26		28
1	who has been an oysterman and an oyster	1	in this case is an argument that some
2	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the	2	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed
2 3	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a	2 3	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and
2 3 4	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years.	2 3 4	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor,
2 3 4 5	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common	2 3 4 5	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations
2 3 4 5 6	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find	2 3 4 5 6	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of
2 3 4 5 6 7	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs	2 3 4 5 6 7	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and other predators in. Some don't. Some are 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be seen on this slide, he concludes that it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and other predators in. Some don't. Some are closed. We saw some of those pictures a bit 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be seen on this slide, he concludes that it's likely there was a sequence of events. He's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and other predators in. Some don't. Some are closed. We saw some of those pictures a bit ago with the egg sacs on them. He measures 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be seen on this slide, he concludes that it's likely there was a sequence of events. He's still not sure. And he hasn't seen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and other predators in. Some don't. Some are closed. We saw some of those pictures a bit ago with the egg sacs on them. He measures the salinity. He takes other environmental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be seen on this slide, he concludes that it's likely there was a sequence of events. He's still not sure. And he hasn't seen Dr. Kimbro's data, and he hasn't done his own
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and other predators in. Some don't. Some are closed. We saw some of those pictures a bit ago with the egg sacs on them. He measures the salinity. He takes other environmental measurements. And here's the conclusions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be seen on this slide, he concludes that it's likely there was a sequence of events. He's still not sure. And he hasn't done his own field experiments; but he, with other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	who has been an oysterman and an oyster dealer for virtually his whole life in the Apalachicola. And his family has held a lease to harvest oysters for nearly 60 years. And what he says is that it used to be common to harvest hundreds of oysters and maybe find one conch. Now, there's probably 100 conchs per oyster. That's a fundamental change ecologically in the bay. And that's caused by salinity higher salinities because there's lower flows, as we talked about earlier, by disease, and other items. So, your Honor, we will have an expert named Dr. Kimbro probably early next week who will explain exactly what studies he's been doing. And he has used cages that he's put out into the bay between 2013 and 2016 his experiments are still ongoing, of course to measure exactly what's happening with oysters. Some of the cages allow conchs and other predators in. Some don't. Some are closed. We saw some of those pictures a bit ago with the egg sacs on them. He measures the salinity. He takes other environmental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	in this case is an argument that some University of Florida professors believed it's overharvesting that's the culprit and not the severe low flows. Well, your Honor, we will show through deposition designations exactly what the chair of that University of Florida oyster group says. He says, we did not find evidence to link overharvesting with the crash of the population. Now, Georgia also argues that a gentleman named Dr. Bill Pine believes it's overharvesting or at least that he doesn't know what it is. And he's written two or contributed to two different reports on this in 2015. And the first report I would point out, your Honor, that he says that further research is required, which, of course, we have done with Dr. Kimbro and others. In his second report from 2015, along with a number of other authors that can be seen on this slide, he concludes that it's likely there was a sequence of events. He's still not sure. And he hasn't seen Dr. Kimbro's data, and he hasn't done his own

	TRIAL - October	131, 2	
	29	1	31
1	authors, concludes it's likely that a	1	some of the sloughs I mentioned. They feed
2	sequence of events occurred whereby low river	2	off of the main channel, and they carry water
3	flow led to increased salinity in	3	to the floodplain. They're essential for
4	Apalachicola Bay for a multi-year period	4	this ecosystem to be healthy. And when the
5	which led to increases in oyster parasites,	5	water recedes, when there is not enough flow
6	predators, unknown pathogens causing elevated	6	from Georgia to the Apalachicola River, they
7	mortality, particularly among juvenile	7	dry up. Here is a map of some of the
8	oysters.	8	sloughs. The sloughs are up and down the
9	Now, that's pretty close to what you	9	entire or most of the river; and you can
10	just heard Mr. Berrigan say on his tape.	10	find them in many places. But here is what
11	Now, that's not all the evidence we'll	11	happens when they dry up. You're stranding
12	have about the bay. We have an expert named	12	breeding fish. You're killing mussels. All
13	Dr. Glibert, who is an expert on estuaries.	13	sorts of other parts of the ecosystem suffer.
14	And she'll talk about the profound changes in	14	These are dead mussels in a slough right
15	the food web, which extend which certainly	15	here. And you fundamentally change what's
16	include impacts on foundational species like	16	happening out in the ecosystem.
			This is what it's supposed to look like,
17	oysters, but include other species and other	17	
18	impacts in the phytoplankton and other	18	your Honor, in the floodplain. There's some
19	elements of the estuary. But her conclusion	19	beautiful cypress and tupelo trees. But when
20	is if something isn't done, this will be a	20	the floodplain doesn't fill, you have
21	permanent change to the bay. And it's	21	profound impacts on the forest, too.
22	already been impacted very severely.	22	So this data, this chart, is from
23	So, of course, we also have a case about	23	Dr. Allan's testimony. And it it's
24	the Apalachicola River. And when I say the	24	between 1976 and 2004. It doesn't even
25	river, I really also mean the floodplain and	25	include the most significant recent droughts,
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	30		32
1	30 then the sloughs, which are channels off the	1	32 your Honor. But what it shows is already by
1 2		1 2	
	then the sloughs, which are channels off the		your Honor. But what it shows is already by
2	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river.	2	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring
2 3	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that	2 3	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this
2 3 4	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the	2 3 4	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees.
2 3 4 5	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel,	2 3 4 5	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate
2 3 4 5 6	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of	2 3 4 5 6	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to
2 3 4 5 6 7	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll	2 3 4 5 6 7	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge reduction in flow for this to happen in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents. Mr. Reheis, who is a former director,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge reduction in flow for this to happen in the channel margins.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents. Mr. Reheis, who is a former director, will likely testify about these. I'm calling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge reduction in flow for this to happen in the channel margins. Here is another picture of stranded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents. Mr. Reheis, who is a former director, will likely testify about these. I'm calling him as a hostile witness on Thursday, your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge reduction in flow for this to happen in the channel margins.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents. Mr. Reheis, who is a former director, will likely testify about these. I'm calling him as a hostile witness on Thursday, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge reduction in flow for this to happen in the channel margins. Here is another picture of stranded mussels. And here, your Honor, is a picture of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents. Mr. Reheis, who is a former director, will likely testify about these. I'm calling him as a hostile witness on Thursday, your Honor. But these documents confess basically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	then the sloughs, which are channels off the mainstem of the river. And so there are many species that depend upon the floodplain of the Apalachicola River and the main channel, amphibians, reptiles, mussels, all sorts of fish who breed in the floodplains. And we'll have multiple experts to talk about this, but in particular Dr. Allan, who will be here in the next couple days. But this this particular slide is from Dr. Allan's prefiled direct testimony. And it highlights first what happens just in the mainstem of the river when you have low flows. So Dr. Allan uses representative species to explain what is happening to all sorts of species in this ecosystem, but this picture depicts low flows. And these are dead endangered mussels. It doesn't take a huge reduction in flow for this to happen in the channel margins.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	your Honor. But what it shows is already by 2004, some of the lowest flows were occurring by that date. You had loss of this floodplain forest. You lost tupelo trees. You lost cypress. These things with adequate flows would take generations to regrow, to recover. And it's much worse than this chart shows today. So why is this happening, your Honor? Well, what we'll show in this next two and a half weeks or so during our case and also during Georgia's case is that there are internal documents dating from the early 1990's, through the 1990's, and throughout the last decade, and even recent documents where internal members of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division and others explain frankly what's happening. So beginning in 1999, there are a series of documents. Mr. Reheis, who is a former director, will likely testify about these. I'm calling him as a hostile witness on Thursday, your Honor.

		51, 20	
	33		35
1	that the laws relating to how farmers can	1	regarded that as a good faith effort to
2	irrigate are the weakest of all Georgia's	2	preserve river flow into Florida.
3	environmental laws. And they were written in	3	Well, what happened after that was
4	a very loose manner to place the minimum	4	disappointing to Florida, your Honor. In
5	amount of requirements on agricultural users.	5	2006 Georgia proposed to issue more
6	And indeed, in 1999 the gentleman I	6	agricultural permits in the Flint River
7	mentioned who will be here Thursday said in a	7	Basin. And here, another important document,
8	public presentation, in southwest Georgia in	8	Florida Exhibit 46, the U.S. Fish and
9	the Flint Basin that the State will need to	9	Wildlife Service wrote to Georgia and
10	put a cap on water depletions one of these	10	explained, you have already got a current
11	days, which is, of course, what we're asking	11	overallocation of water in the Flint River
	for in this case.		
12		12	Basin. Current permits need to be reassessed
13	And here, your Honor, is an important	13	and constrained to reasonable use.
14	document. It's Florida Exhibit 4. It is a	14	But Georgia, nevertheless, did issue a
15	set of talking points developed by multiple	15	whole number of new permits. In fact, since
16	members of Georgia's Environmental Protection	16	the time that the Flint River Drought
17	Division. It will be prominent today in the	17	Protection Act passed, there are probably
18	deposition designations we play for	18	more than 150,000 new acres in the Flint
19	Mr. Napoleon Caldwell.	19	River Basin.
20	But here what Georgia said is and in	20	So the rationale for issuing this new
21	1999 we've already exceeded the safe upper	21	acreage was, well, we'll buy out irrigation
22	limit of permittable acreage in the Lower	22	rights under the Flint River Drought
23	Flint. Overuse will cause severe impacts.	23	Protection Act. The problem, your Honor, is
24	It will hurt Georgia's chances in federal	24	that didn't happen.
25	court if we let irrigation deplete the Flint	25	In 2007, as the chart here shows, there
-	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	.34		36
1	34 River If new irrigation uses are not	1	36 was a terrible drought - Flint River Drought
1	River. If new irrigation uses are not	1	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought
2	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create	2	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the
2 3	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently	2 3	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another
2 3 4	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state	2 3 4	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought
2 3 4 5	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water	2 3 4 5	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used.
2 3 4 5 6	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers.	2 3 4	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this
2 3 4 5	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to	2 3 4 5	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was
2 3 4 5 6	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now	2 3 4 5 6	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on.
2 3 4 5 6 7	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them.	2 3 4 5 6 7	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River Drought Protection Act, to take acreage out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's. And it's clear that water use upstream of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River Drought Protection Act, to take acreage out of irrigation production during times of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's. And it's clear that water use upstream of Florida is the primary factor causing record
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River Drought Protection Act, to take acreage out of irrigation production during times of severe drought. That is to reduce the amount	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's. And it's clear that water use upstream of Florida is the primary factor causing record low streamflow. It's a fundamental change in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River Drought Protection Act, to take acreage out of irrigation production during times of severe drought. That is to reduce the amount of irrigation in the Flint Basin during severe drought.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's. And it's clear that water use upstream of Florida is the primary factor causing record low streamflow. It's a fundamental change in the regional hydrology. The bay and river
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River Drought Protection Act, to take acreage out of irrigation production during times of severe drought. That is to reduce the amount of irrigation in the Flint Basin during	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's. And it's clear that water use upstream of Florida is the primary factor causing record low streamflow. It's a fundamental change in the regional hydrology. The bay and river have existed for millennia, and in the last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	River. If new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have. In the worst case, the Georgia state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers. All of these facts have become known to Georgia over the course of 1998. It is now necessary to act on them. Well, your Honor, there was some action in 2000. It was called the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And this initial action, as this document FX-10, Florida Exhibit 10, shows was motivated by high use of irrigation dramatically reducing the flow of the Flint River. This particular document is the official legislative history for the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And it explains the purpose of the Flint River Drought Protection Act, to take acreage out of irrigation production during times of severe drought. That is to reduce the amount of irrigation in the Flint Basin during severe drought. Mr. Reheis will testify that Georgia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was a terrible drought. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. In 2008, the same. 2011, the same. 2012, another terrible drought year. Flint River Drought Protection Act wasn't used. So there's no question that during this time period Georgia knew exactly what was going on. This is an important document, your Honor, as well. It's Florida Exhibit 49d1. It's a study funded by the State of Georgia. And it focuses on the reasons for low flows in the Flint. And what it says is that agricultural irrigation is fundamentally changing or has by that point fundamentally changed the hydrology of the basin. There is no climatologic indication that recent droughts were more severe or persistent than those in the past in the 1930's or 1950's. And it's clear that water use upstream of Florida is the primary factor causing record low streamflow. It's a fundamental change in the regional hydrology. The bay and river have existed for millennia, and in the last 30 years the flows have been fundamentally

	TRIAL - October	31, 20	
	37		39
1	changed by upstream water consumption.	1	explains some of the things that can be done,
2	So, your Honor, by 2012, we can see	2	your Honor, acquire easements for permanent
3	documents internal documents by Georgia	3	removal of acres from irrigation pay
4	that explain exactly what the problem is with	4	farmers not to irrigate, or temporarily
5	the Flint River Drought Protection Act from	5	during severe drought years or transfer
6	their perspective. And what they say is	6	water users to deeper aquifers.
7	pretty blunt. No funds are currently	7	There are a range of possible solutions
8	appropriated for this purpose. There is no	8	here, your Honor, almost all of which Georgia
9	money to buy out irrigation. That's the	9	at least internally has considered. And they
10	problem, your Honor. There is no money.	10	recognize in this and many other documents
11	And, candidly, the then EP	11	that long-term solutions are needed. The
12	Environmental Protection director said in	12	problem is that there have been no long-term
13	this press release, Joint Exhibit 69, there	13	solutions implemented. And we're seeing,
14	is no doubt we need a viable management tool	14	even today, much lower flows than we should
15	to deal with drought in the Flint River	15	be.
16	Basin, but the Flint River Drought Protection	16	So what can be done in this Original
17	Act lacks any funding.	17	Action to remedy this problem?
18	So after 2012 and indeed after we filed	18	Well, there are solutions that our
19	this case in 2013, Georgia continues to try	19	experts will describe in some detail,
20	to figure out what to do. And there are many	20	including Dr. Sunding, for Metro Atlanta.
21	documents that will show from that time	21	Even reducing drought year lawn watering can
22	period. This particular document, Florida	22	have an important impact. Metro Atlanta did
23	Exhibit 49b, is a presentation that was made	23	that in 2007, but declined to do it in 2011
24	at a meeting between Georgia's Environmental	24	or '12 when we have seen the worst flows in
25	Protection Division, who convened the	25	history. There are other infrastructure
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
			Mason & Lockhart
	iviason & Locknart		
	Mason & Lockhart 38		
1	38	1	40
1	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties	1	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk
2	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a		40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail.
	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser	2	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are
2 3	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in	2 3	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done.
2 3 4	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia.	2 3 4	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in
2 3 4 5	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what	2 3 4 5	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient
2 3 4 5 6	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the	2 3 4 5 6	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same
2 3 4 5 6 7	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some	2 3 4 5 6 7	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify steps that can be taken today rather than	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many. Now, it shouldn't take lawyers taking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify steps that can be taken today rather than freezing to see what happens. In other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many. Now, it shouldn't take lawyers taking depositions for a regulatory program to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify steps that can be taken today rather than freezing to see what happens. In other words, Georgia knew that it had to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many. Now, it shouldn't take lawyers taking depositions for a regulatory program to recognize it's got 90,000 illegal acres of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify steps that can be taken today rather than freezing to see what happens. In other words, Georgia knew that it had to do something.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many. Now, it shouldn't take lawyers taking depositions for a regulatory program to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify steps that can be taken today rather than freezing to see what happens. In other words, Georgia knew that it had to do something. And this same document, Joint Exhibit 154,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many. Now, it shouldn't take lawyers taking depositions for a regulatory program to recognize it's got 90,000 illegal acres of irrigation land of irrigated land. And our conclusion from that is that there is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	38 meeting, and a number of interested parties in the Lower Flint Basin. This is a presentation by a Georgia technical adviser going back he was a technical adviser in 2006 and has been thereafter for Georgia. This particular presentation supports what we're saying in this case about all the causes, your Honor. And we'll spend some time on this presentation in this trial. But after that meeting, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division personnel who attended got together and wrote a meeting summary explaining what happened in that meeting. And here is what was recorded as statements by the then director of Georgia's Environmental Protection Division; Florida's equitable apportionment action, this Original Action, is a challenge and can seem overwhelming. But, Director Turner explained, it's important that we identify steps that can be taken today rather than freezing to see what happens. In other words, Georgia knew that it had to do something.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	40 investments that can be made that we'll talk about in some detail. On the Upper Flint, similarly, there are a whole range of things that can be done. And that's also true on the Lower Flint, in particular with respect to more efficient irrigation. If Georgia just used the same controls on irrigation that Florida already employs in its part of the ACF Basin, a lot of water would be saved. Now, on this slide there's a the second bullet reads, eliminate illegally irrigated acres. Your Honor, during discovery in this case we took a deposition of one of Georgia's witnesses. And we determined by taking that deposition, by looking at the underlying documents that up to 90,000 acres in the Lower Flint Basin are illegally being irrigated. They're not permitted to irrigate that many. Now, it shouldn't take lawyers taking depositions for a regulatory program to recognize it's got 90,000 illegal acres of irrigation land of irrigated land. And

	41		43
	a sufficiently serious regulatory program	1	occurs. And indeed, there can be a solution
1		2	that, without harming farmers, limits that
3	overseeing irrigation in the Lower Flint Basin.	3	irrigation.
		4	-
4	Through Dr. Sunding and others we'll	-	So let me close this opening, your
5	cap we'll propose how to exactly cap	5	Honor, by referring again to the Florida
6	amounts of irrigation water in the way that	6	Constitution. It shall be the policy of the
7	Florida already does and, indeed, discuss the	7	State of Florida to conserve and protect its
8	same sorts of possible solutions that we see	8	natural resources.
9	in Georgia documents.	9	That's what we're here to do, your
10	But in the end, at the end of our	10	Honor. But it's important for me to
11	presentation, your Honor, we will show that	11	emphasize one other thing. And that is I
12	our consumption cap would be practicable,	12	introduced the Mayor of Apalachicola earlier.
13	that it would be verifiable by a third party,	13	I introduced the city attorney. The
14	which the States can agree upon, and indeed	14	communities that live in the Apalachicola
15	that an appropriate consumption cap, using	15	Basin are critical to Florida. They have
16	all the sorts of tools Georgia can select	16	relied on that beauty and health and the
17	which tools it wants to use to achieve the	17	oyster fishery in that area for generations.
18	outcome but it need not cause any	18	It's a unique area. It's a unique community.
19	significant financial harm to Atlanta or to individual farmers.	19	And we're trying to save them.
20		20	Thank you, your Honor.
21	Your Honor, the State of Georgia had a	21	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you,
22	policy for years and years where it allowed	22	counsel.
23 24	farmers to apply for and get permits with virtually no environmental scrutiny. And it	23 24	Mr. Primis?
24 25	created a problem that it needs to fix now.	24 25	MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Craig Primis for the State of Georgia.
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	25	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
-	42		44
1	And it can fix it without harming farmers and	1	We shared our equipment with Florida for
2	without harming Atlanta.	2	Mr. Perry's presentation; so we just need to
3	So Georgia has said in its pretrial	3	switch over, do a little logistical work. It
4	brief and elsewhere that it thinks that the	4	will take two or three minutes to get my
5	right thing to do in this case is restore the	5	presentation up and running.
6	status quo. Well, we have two comments on	6	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Why don't we
7	that, your Honor. First, the status quo for	7	stand in recess then.
8	millennia has been a healthy riverine	8	(Time Noted: 10:05 a.m.)
-		-	
9	ecosystem and a healthy Apalachicola Bay.	9	
9 10	ecosystem and a healthy Apalachicola Bay. And what Georgia has done has occurred in the	9 10	(Recess Called)
	ecosystem and a healthy Apalachicola Bay. And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if	-	
10	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the	10	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.)
10 11	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if	10 11	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis?
10 11 12	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so,	10 11 12	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master
10 11 12 13	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good	10 11 12 13	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster.
10 11 12 13 14	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought	10 11 12 13 14	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a
10 11 12 13 14 15	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation	10 11 12 13 14 15	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now,
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's the status quo it's protecting what Florida	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now, we look forward to presenting our evidence. As we do so, it will quickly become clear that Florida cannot meet the significant
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's the status quo it's protecting what Florida has set aside and protected in the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now, we look forward to presenting our evidence. As we do so, it will quickly become clear
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's the status quo it's protecting what Florida has set aside and protected in the Apalachicola River and the Basin; and I don't think it's appropriate, and we'll argue vigorously that it's not appropriate to	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now, we look forward to presenting our evidence. As we do so, it will quickly become clear that Florida cannot meet the significant burden it faces in this case, and the remedy it seeks could have serious consequences for
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's the status quo it's protecting what Florida has set aside and protected in the Apalachicola River and the Basin; and I don't think it's appropriate, and we'll argue vigorously that it's not appropriate to preserve, simply for economic reasons,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now, we look forward to presenting our evidence. As we do so, it will quickly become clear that Florida cannot meet the significant burden it faces in this case, and the remedy it seeks could have serious consequences for Georgia and its citizens with little or no
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's the status quo it's protecting what Florida has set aside and protected in the Apalachicola River and the Basin; and I don't think it's appropriate, and we'll argue vigorously that it's not appropriate to preserve, simply for economic reasons, unnecessary and wasteful irrigation where it	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now, we look forward to presenting our evidence. As we do so, it will quickly become clear that Florida cannot meet the significant burden it faces in this case, and the remedy it seeks could have serious consequences for Georgia and its citizens with little or no benefit to Florida or the Apalachicola River
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And what Georgia has done has occurred in the last 30 years to change that. But even if you only focus on the last 15 years or so, Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good faith step to pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation and then, because it became too expensive, they halted it. Your Honor, if there's anything that's the status quo it's protecting what Florida has set aside and protected in the Apalachicola River and the Basin; and I don't think it's appropriate, and we'll argue vigorously that it's not appropriate to preserve, simply for economic reasons,	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Recess Called) (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master Lancaster. And may it please the Court, it is a privilege to stand before you today on behalf of the people of Georgia. We very much appreciate the time and attention the Special Master has dedicated to this case; and now, we look forward to presenting our evidence. As we do so, it will quickly become clear that Florida cannot meet the significant burden it faces in this case, and the remedy it seeks could have serious consequences for Georgia and its citizens with little or no

	45		47
1	or Bay.	1	Florida barely mentions these critical
2	The Supreme Court has repeatedly warned	2	issues, but Georgia will address all of them;
3	that an equitable apportionment is an	3	and we will urge the Court to do so, too.
4	extraordinary remedy and not one to be	4	And just so there is no misunderstanding
5	imposed lightly. Justice Cardozo put it best	5	on one key point, Georgia emphatically
6	80 years ago in Washington versus Oregon. As	6	rejects the suggestion that it has not been a
7	I have shown on the screen, there the Court	7	good steward of water. We are proud to
8	said, before this Court can be moved to	8	defend and will defend Georgia's stewardship
	exercise its extraordinary power under the	9	of this resource in both metropolitan Atlanta
9	Constitution to control the conduct of one		-
10		10	and the agricultural sector of the state.
11	state at the suit of another, the threatened	11	At the outset, I want to emphasize what
12	invasion of rights must be of serious	12	is at stake in this case. What is at stake
13	magnitude and it must be established by clear	13	is the economic well-being of millions of
14	and convincing evidence.	14	Georgians who depend on the Chattahoochee
15	50 years later in Colorado versus New	15	River, the Flint River, and the federal
16	Mexico, the Court repeated the need for clear	16	reservoir system, which Mr. Perry failed to
17	and convincing evidence, and it explained	17	mention, for their drinking water, their
18	that the consequences of getting this wrong	18	food, their jobs, their entire way of life.
19	can be devastating.	19	What's at stake is an economy that supports
20	If I can refer the Court to the monitor,	20	millions of jobs and billions of dollars in
21	the Court in Colorado explained that	21	economic activity throughout Georgia and
22	society's interest in minimizing erroneous	22	beyond.
23	decisions in equitable apportionment cases	23	Let's look at some of the key
24	requires that hard facts, not suppositions or	24	differences between Georgia and Florida in
25	opinions, be the basis for interstate	25	the ACF Basin. I put on the screen and the
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	46		48
1	diversions. Hard facts are required, the	1	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF
2	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result	2	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida
2 3	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically	2 3	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over
2 3 4	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential	2 3 4	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have
2 3 4 5	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be	2 3 4 5	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on
2 3 4 5 6	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote.	2 3 4 5 6	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the
2 3 4 5	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have	2 3 4 5	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but
2 3 4 5 6	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts	2 3 4 5 6	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more
2 3 4 5 6 7	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida essentially ignores all the other elements	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all. And the ACF portion in Georgia is home
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida essentially ignores all the other elements the Supreme Court has articulated before an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all. And the ACF portion in Georgia is home to Atlanta, the ninth largest metropolitan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida essentially ignores all the other elements the Supreme Court has articulated before an equitable apportionment may be ordered,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all. And the ACF portion in Georgia is home to Atlanta, the ninth largest metropolitan area in the nation. To put that in context,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida essentially ignores all the other elements the Supreme Court has articulated before an equitable apportionment may be ordered, elements like injury, causation, equitable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all. And the ACF portion in Georgia is home to Atlanta, the ninth largest metropolitan area in the nation. To put that in context, the Atlanta metro region is 20 percent larger
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida essentially ignores all the other elements the Supreme Court has articulated before an equitable apportionment may be ordered, elements like injury, causation, equitable balancing, remedy, and necessary parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all. And the ACF portion in Georgia is home to Atlanta, the ninth largest metropolitan area in the nation. To put that in context, the Atlanta metro region is 20 percent larger than the next largest, which just happens to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	diversions. Hard facts are required, the Court said, because the harm that may result from disrupting established uses is typically certain and immediate, whereas, the potential benefits from a proposed diversion may be speculative and remote. That is exactly the situation we have here. Florida does not have the hard facts the Court requires. Its injury case is built on speculation and on harms not caused by Georgia. And the damage a consumption cap would cause Georgia would be certain and immediate. Now, Mr. Perry spent the balance of his opening arguing that the Court should cap Georgia's water use because of growth in Georgia's agricultural sector. Georgia will address that claim both in its opening and throughout the trial, but for present purposes the important point is that Florida essentially ignores all the other elements the Supreme Court has articulated before an equitable apportionment may be ordered, elements like injury, causation, equitable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Court can see the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin is five times the size of the Florida portion. Georgia ACF population is over 5 million people. Florida doesn't have 100,000. There were over 2 million jobs on the Georgia side and just 25,000 on the Florida side. It's not pictured there, but the economy in the Georgia portion is more than 100 times the size of the Florida economy. And just focusing for a minute on the agricultural part of the basin in the bottom right corner, Georgia generates more than 1.3 billion dollars a year that's billion growing row crops like corn and soybeans, while revenues on oysters in a good year barely average about \$6-1/2 million in Florida. We had to insert the number on this part of the chart because the oyster line is not visible at all. And the ACF portion in Georgia is home to Atlanta, the ninth largest metropolitan area in the nation. To put that in context, the Atlanta metro region is 20 percent larger

 be Boston, right down the road. With these basic facts in mind, I would like to draw the Court's statemion to this chart which shows the average annual flow that Florida receives at the state line, which is shown in blue. You can compare that orden and the state line, which is shown in blue. You can compare that consumes in a year, which is shown in green along the bottom. Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the evidence. And that was no accident. The evidence will show that Florida's proof of injury cannot possibly meet the clear and convincing standard. and the bottom. Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the in the AC Basin already flows over the state in the AC Basin already flows over the state in the AC Basin already flows over the state in the risk in this case disproparionately the risk in this case disproparionately the some line, Florida receives steady and t will still continue to receive steady fat conromy. fat conromy. fat conromy. fat conromy. fat conromic harm to read muth it, Georgia's rone sing. forda devendable flows in a drought and, in forda the anoth and werk stat deriver in a rone sommy will be harmed. And this is not and fordad is asking that are argoing fordad al another conomist, for conys in the southwest part of the state. <		10	01, 20	- 1
2 With these basic facts in mind, I would 2 Finda devoted just two pages of its alleged injury, 3 ikke to faw the Court's attention to this 3 pretrial brief to its alleged injury, 4 chart which shows the average annual flow 4 offering predictions of doom, but no actual 5 that Florida receives at the state line, 6 ordina devoted just two pages of its 6 which is shown in blace. a offering predictions of doom, but no actual 6 7 adve with the amount of water that Georgia convincing statemandard. 0 10 Now, Mr, Perry put up a chart at the in others, the harm Florida claims was not 1 12 overstated Georgia's consumption of water, and the ill strue proportion of water that 1 14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 1 oursets tating in that it was. 1 15 nth a CF Basin already flows over that Georgia's consumption a small amount. 1 1 16 beorgia's natural resource economist, 1 1 1 1 16 testry, the proportion of water that Georgia's 1 1 <th></th> <th>49</th> <th></th> <th>51</th>		49		51
 a like to draw the Court's attention to this chart which shows the average annual flow that Florida receives at the state line, which is shown in blue. You can compare that value with the amount of water that Georgia consumes in a year, which is shown in green along the bottom. Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the beginning of his presentation which vastly overstated Georgia's consumption of water chart shows, the vast majority of the water consumes in aiready flows over the state in the ACF Basin already flows over the state ine into Florida; and Georgia consumes only a scale dispopution of water that Georgia's consumes is minuscule compared to the size of tespopulation and its economy. That is why the risk in this case disproportionately and the mit needs in normal and wet years; and the mit hered she normal and wet years; and the must is not mail and wet years; and the mit shis cast metored earlies today. fact, more than nature would deliver in a fact, more than nature would deliver in a fact, more than nature would deliver in a forday the ais shad gotten better georgia's mater use in this case, Georgia's forday but was is out methored earlies today. forda ba another economis, forda seeking for georgia's water use in this case, Georgia's fard facts and not speculat	1	be Boston, right down the road.	1	and ends at that very first step.
4 offering predictions of doom, but no actual 5 that Horida raceives at the state line, evidence. And that was no accident. The 6 which is shown in blue. You can compare that relate with the amount of water that Georgia 9 along the bottom. 6 9 along the bottom. 9 10 Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the 10 11 beginning of his presentation which vastly 9 12 overstated Georgia's consumption of water, 10 13 and we will show that trial. But as this 11 14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 11 15 and segriga's consumption of water that Georgia 12 16 nerges/and/flow over the state 16 16 in the ACF Basin alreadry flows over the state 16 16 testrift, the proportion of water that Georgia's 16 17 spanil alignout. 17 17 18 bas Georgia's nutrul resource economist, 17 19 trial son Georgia with Florida seeking to capi 16 2	2	With these basic facts in mind, I would	2	Florida devoted just two pages of its
 that Florida receives at the state line, which is shown in blue. You can compare that value with the amount of water that Georgia consumes in a year, which is shown in green along the bottom. Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the beginning of his presentation which wastly overstated Georgia's consumption of water, and we will show that at trail. But as this chart shows, the vast majority of the water in the ACF Basin already flows over the state line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only a small amount. ar Samal amount. ar Sceorgia's natural resource economist, Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will testify, the proportion of water that Georgia's consumes is minuscule compared to the size of falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap falls on Georgia water use and with hit, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart forda hat an otype culation and its economy. the same time, Florida receives smore and it will still continue to receive steady and the mill still continue to receive steady and the army Corps of Engineers, and the mature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, and the army counce control and station of a size of the size of goosy will be put at risk, and Georgia's actom on the part of Georgia. testify, and Beorgia's actom on the part of Georgia. goosy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlata or growing forda has no speculation. It is also test stath the e saced. That is the mandatory first step livi	3	like to draw the Court's attention to this	3	pretrial brief to its alleged injury,
 that Florida receives at the state line, which is shown in blue. You can compare that value with the amount of water that Georgia consumes in a year, which is shown in green along the bottom. Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the beginning of his presentation which wastly overstated Georgia's consumption of water, and we will show that at trail. But as this chart shows, the vast majority of the water in the ACF Basin already flows over the state line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only a small amount. ar Samal amount. ar Sceorgia's natural resource economist, Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will testify, the proportion of water that Georgia's consumes is minuscule compared to the size of falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap falls on Georgia water use and with hit, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart forda hat an otype culation and its economy. the same time, Florida receives smore and it will still continue to receive steady and the mill still continue to receive steady and the army Corps of Engineers, and the mature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, and the army counce control and station of a size of the size of goosy will be put at risk, and Georgia's actom on the part of Georgia. testify, and Beorgia's actom on the part of Georgia. goosy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlata or growing forda has no speculation. It is also test stath the e saced. That is the mandatory first step livi	4	chart which shows the average annual flow	4	offering predictions of doom, but no actual
 which is shown in blue. You can compare that value with the amount of water that Georgia consumes in a year, which is shown in green along the bottom. andy we will show that is true for two reasons. In mony, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the in beginning of his presentation which vastly overstated Georgia's consumption of water, an and we will show that at trail. But as this in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in the Ior Forida; and Georgia consumes only a small amount. As Georgia's natural resource economist, Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will versus is minuscule compared to the size of its population and its economy. That is why the risk perportion of water that Georgia's consumes is minuscule compared to the size of its population and its economy. That is why the rest in this case disproportionately the REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart economy, will be put at risk; and Georgia's rometary sense the impact on Florida is acodemic exercise. These are real poole is dignificant risk of economic hardship for norgan advectuation from the Army Corps of Engineses, anotter entity that was not mentioned earlier toray. fordia has another exercise. These are real poole torays, none, of any economic harm at all academic exercise. These are real poole that sits of econom. It is also the sits why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why the supreme Court demands hard facts and to speculation. It is also why that sits corn to proving the water that there is actual injury that needs	5	_	5	
7 value with the amount of water that Georgia 7 injury cannot possibly meet the clear and convincing standard. 8 consumes in a year, which is shown in green along the bottom. 9 And that is true for two reasons. In 10 10 Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the 11 9 And that is true for two reasons. In 10 12 overstated Georgia's consumption of water, 13 and we will show that at trial. But as this 14 14 convincing standard. 13 and we will show that at trial. But as this 14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 14 convincing value adout the size of 16 14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 15 in others, the harm Florida claims was not 11 convincing value adout the size of 16 convincing value adout the sis value adout the sis of 20 <th></th> <th></th> <th>-</th> <th></th>			-	
a consumes in a year, which is shown in green a convincing standard. a long the bottom. And that is true for two reasons. In b long the bottom. many cases, Florida has no injury at all or in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not. in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not. in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not. is population and its conomy. That is why the risk in this case disproportionately is population and its comomy. The Georgia's consumption that Georgia's consumption cor is population and its comomy. The dat is shown and dependable flows in a drought and, in for outher than it needs in normal and wet years; a nd twill still continue to receive steady for congria's water use and with it, Georgia's is population with six; and Georgia's for congria's water use in this case, Georgia's a datependable flows in a drought and, in for outher met. How and the six; and Georgia's i conomy. for outher that was not mentioned earlier i corogria's water use in this case, Georgia's for outher mat. How mas and the sprecula		-	_	•
 along the bottom. Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart at the begining of his presentation which vastly overstated Georgia's consumption of water, and we will show that at trial. But as this chart shows, the vast majority of the water in the ACF Basin already flows over the state fine into Florida; and Georgia consumes only are solution of water that Georgia consumes is minuscue compared to the size of the risk in this case disproportionately falls on Georgia water use and with it, Georgia's to rosumes is minuscue compared to the size of the risk in this case disproportionately falls on Georgia water use and with it, Georgia's torougy. the EREPORTING GROUP Mater than it needs in normal and wet years; and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a r drought from the Army Corps of Engineers; and the wills with sis not an ta cademic exercise. Thes are real people flow sup the Supreme Court were to cap if deorgia's water use in this case, Georgia's acconomy, will be put at risk; and Georgia's conomy will be harmed. And this is not an ta cademic exercise. Thes are real people flord and working in Atlanto or growing if or no good reason. The Supreme Court demands that facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that there is actual injury that needs to be redressed. That is the mandatory first step in the analysis, and Florida's case begins in the analysis, and Florida's case begins in the analysis, and Florida's case begins in the REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart Mater anal				
10 Now, Mr, Perry put up a chart at the 11 10 many cases, Florida has no injury at all or 12 14 beginning of his presentation which vastly 12 overstated Georgia's consumption of water, 13 14 15 and we will show that at trial. But as this 14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 15 15 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 16 16 16 Ine into Florida; and Georgia consumes on pared to the size of 16 16 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 16 16 17 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 19 the risk in this case disproportionately 14 16 feet Georgia's consumption 10 offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 10<			_	-
11 beginning of his presentation which vastly 11 its claimed injury is pure speculation. And 12 overstated Georgia's consumption of water that i others, the harm Florida claims was not 13 and we will show that at trial. But as this i caused by Georgia; and there is no clear, 14 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not 14 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not 15 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not 16 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state in others, the harm Florida claims was not 16 and will shut dat trial. was mall amount. is consomic or 16 oregrals with florida seeding to cap is spopulation and its economy. That is why is population and its economy. That is why is border. 14 falls on Georgia with Florida receives more is another entity that was not mentioned earlier is water than it needs in normal and wet years; is another entity that was not mentioned earlier 15 economy. for water than it needs in normal and wet years; is economy will be harmad traim working in Atlana or growing is consume was, nothing comais, pr. Suding, never even <th></th> <th>-</th> <th>-</th> <th></th>		-	-	
12 overstated Georgia's consumption of water, 13 in others, the harm Florida claims was not 14 13 and we will show that at trial. But as this 14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 15 in others, the harm Florida claims was not 14 14 convincing evidence to claim that it was. 15 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state 16 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state 16 16 line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only 17 a small amount. 16 16 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 20 the opinion that Georgia's consumption 20 of water harmed Florida's economy. Florida's 21 21 the risk in this case disproportionately 22 iead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even 22 20 22 for lead of the same 21 iso ong wills be and with it, Georgia's 23 18 23 At the same time, Florida receives more 3 water than it needs in normal and wet years; 4 and it will still continue to receive steady 3 19 you attempted to quantify in any economit or 2 money the admit of the admother economist, 3 2 14 coordy will be put at risk; and Georgia's 3 academic exercise. These are real people 3 19 you attempted to quantify in any economit for 3 14 academic exercise. These are real people 3 19 you attempted to Ge	10		10	
 and we will show that at trial. But as this chart shows, the vast majority of the water in the ACF Basin already flows over the state line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only a small amount. As Georgia's natural resource economist, Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will testify, the proportion of water that Georgia consumes is minuscule compared to the size of tis population and its economy. That is why ther is in this case disproportionately falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, and ite will still continue to receive stady and term from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. fus will be put at risk; and Georgia's corops in the southwest part of the state. for ogo dreason. This is why the Supreme Court were to cap fusing and working in Statina or growing corops in the southwest part of the state. frond and nother economist, and this is not an a caused by Georgia's consumptive water or with scase, Georgia's consp will be harmed. And this is not an a causent scalal noity provide scalar scala not speculation. It is also with scase and econic hardship for nogo dreason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also with the conomic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also with t	11		11	
14 chart shows, the vast majority of the water 15 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state 16 line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only 17 a small amount. 18 AS Georgia's natural resource economist, 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 20 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia 21 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 22 its population and its economy. That is why 23 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's 24 fails on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 25 factomy. 21 economy. 22 If you look at the screen, you will see 25 the same time, Florida receives more 30 fact more than nature would deliver in a 7 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 10 ford, more than nature would deliver in a 7 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 10 ford, more than nature would deliver in a 11 coerogi	12	overstated Georgia's consumption of water,	12	in others, the harm Florida claims was not
15 in the ACF Basin already flows over the state 15 One injury allegation we can dispense 16 line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only if with quickly is economic injury. Florida 17 a small amount. if a small amount. if a consume is minuscule compared to the size of 10 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 18 as consumes is minuscule compared to the size of offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 14 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap offer the admitted that. He was asked, have 15 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 16 facmoy. 50 17 economy. forda had another economist, and the server, you will see 18 economy. forda had another economist, and his answer was, nothing comes to 17 and the will still continue to receive steady s and he work the coming to trial to 19 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's s economy in the basin had gotten beter or 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap forda had another economist, and working in Athata or growing 19 lowid were tharmed florida is asking this Court to put them s economy in the basin had gotten b	13	and we will show that at trial. But as this	13	caused by Georgia; and there is no clear,
16 line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only 16 with quickly is economic injury. Florida 17 a small amount. 17 hird one, but two Ph.D. economists as 18 As Georgia's natural resource economist, 19 preserts in this case. And neither of them 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 20 of water harmed Florida's economy. Florida's 21 lead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even 20 looked at impacts on the Florida side of the 23 the risk in this case disproportionately 24 If you look at the screen, you will see 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 50 1 you attempted to quantify in any economic or 2 and it will still continue to receive steady 5 1 you attempted to quantify in any economic or 3 andther mity that was not mentioned earlier 1 10 If the supreme Court were to cap 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 10 Worse. So Florida had another economist, 17 Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's 10 10 10 14 academic exercise. These are real people 11	14	chart shows, the vast majority of the water	14	convincing evidence to claim that it was.
16 line into Florida; and Georgia consumes only 16 with quickly is economic injury. Florida 17 a small amount. 17 hird one, but two Ph.D. economists as 18 As Georgia's natural resource economist, 19 preserts in this case. And neither of them 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 20 of water harmed Florida's economy. Florida's 21 lead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even 20 looked at impacts on the Florida side of the 23 the risk in this case disproportionately 24 If you look at the screen, you will see 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 50 1 you attempted to quantify in any economic or 2 and it will still continue to receive steady 5 1 you attempted to quantify in any economic or 3 andther mity that was not mentioned earlier 1 10 If the supreme Court were to cap 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 10 Worse. So Florida had another economist, 17 Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's 10 10 10 14 academic exercise. These are real people 11	15	in the ACF Basin already flows over the state	15	One injury allegation we can dispense
17 a small amount. 17 hired not one, but two Ph.D. economists as 18 As Georgia's natural resource economist, 18 experts in this case. And neither of them 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 19 offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 20 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia's consumption 10 offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 21 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia's consumption 10 offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 22 testify, the proportionately 21 lead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even 23 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's 17 Mason & Lockhart 24 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 22 If you look at the screen, you will see 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's 50 1 12 you attempted to quantify in any economic or 2 At the same time, Florida receives more 3 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 1 You attempted to quantify in any economic, or 3 and twill still continue to receive steady 4 And his answer was, nothing comes to 5 4 forought from tha Army Corps of Engine	16	-	16	
18 As Georgia's natural resource economist, 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 10 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia's 11 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 12 is population and its economy. That is why 13 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 14 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 15 population and its economy. That is why 14 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 15 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's 16 reconomy. 17 economy. 18 experts in this case. And neither of them 19 offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption 12 looked at impacts on the Florida's economy. Florida's 14 reconomy. 50 15 economy. 52 16 economy form the Army Corps of Engineers, and his answer was, nothing comes to 16 fact, more than nature would deliver in a forda bad another economist, 17 Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's 18 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>				
 19 Dr. Robert Stavins from Harvard, will 20 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia 21 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 22 its population and its economy. That is why 23 the risk in this case disproportionately 24 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's 26 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's 27 HE REPORTING GROUP 28 Mason & Lockhart 29 and the same time, Florida receives more 3 water than it needs in normal and wet years; 4 and ti will still continue to receive steady 5 and dependable flows in a drought and, in 6 fact, more than nature would deliver in a 7 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, a another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today. 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 11 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 Gropia is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that ther is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins 22 THE REPORTING GROUP 23 Mather es actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins 25 THE REPOR				
 testify, the proportion of water that Georgia consumes is minuscule compared to the size of its population and its economy. That is why the risk in this case disproportionately falls on Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart fact, more than nature would deliver in a factory. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia geonomy will be put at risk; and Georgia's aconomy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convi				•
21 consumes is minuscule compared to the size of 21 lead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even 22 tis population and its economy. That is why 21 lead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even 23 the risk in this case disproportionately 22 looked at impacts on the Florida side of the 24 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 25 where he admitted that. He was asked, have 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 50 1 economy. 50 2 At the same time, Florida receives more 3 Georgia's consumptive water use? 4 and it will still continue to receive steady 5 and the ill continue to receive steady 5 and the mature would deliver in a 7 forought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today. 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 10 Witne esault whether Florida's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 With wants clear and convincing evidence				
 22 its population and its economy. That is why 23 the risk in this case disproportionately 24 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP 26 Mason & Lockhart 27 At the same time, Florida receives more 28 and the mattire would deliver in a 29 dependable flows in a drought and, in 20 fact, more than nature would deliver in a 21 doed at impacts on the Florida of 22 looked at impacts on the Storen, you will see 23 border. 24 If you look at the screen, you will see 25 where he admitted that. He was asked, have 21 THE REPORTING GROUP 22 Mathe same time, Florida receives more 23 and it will still continue to receive steady 3 and they from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today. 11 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 crops in the southwest part of the state. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins 26 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 				-
 the risk in this case disproportionately the risk in this case disproportionately falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 50 economy. At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia geonomy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no god reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 		•		, 5,
 24 falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap 25 Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 20 The supreme Court were to cap 21 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 22 at the same time, Florida receives steady 3 and the will still continue to receive steady 3 and the wants deliver in a 4 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today. 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 11 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 16 if act, more than ant are young 16 roody. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 24 If you look at the screen, you will see 25 where he admitted that. He was asked, have THE REPORTING GROUP 21 Mason & Lockhart 22 At the same time, Florida receives more 23 water than it needs in normal and wet years; 4 and norther economist, 7 Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's 8 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 16 intig and working in Atlanta or growing 16 crops in the southwest part of the state. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 widence it has advanced.<	22			
25Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart25where he admitted that. He was asked, have THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart5050521economy.50521economy.50521and it will still continue to receive steady s and dependable flows in a drought and, in 6 fact, more than nature would deliver in a 7 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier today.1you attempted to quantify in any economic or 210If the Supreme Court were to cap 10If the Supreme Court were to cap 116Florida had another economist, 8 economy, but he never asked whether Florida's 8 economy in the basin had gotten better or 10811Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 crops in the southwest part of the state. 1711With no economic harm at all 14 at any point in time resulting from any 1516With no economic hardship for 19 no good reason.16With no economic harm alone can never 20 2020why it wants clear and convincing evidence 2316harm. And while Georgia does not take the 19 posibily do so in this case given the high 20 2124hard facts and not speculative 2316harm. And while Georgia does not take the 19 2026in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart <th>23</th> <th></th> <th>23</th> <th></th>	23		23	
THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & LockhartTHE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart50501economy.2At the same time, Florida receives more 3 water than it needs in normal and wet years; 4 and it will still continue to receive steady 5 and dependable flows in a drought and, in 6 fact, more than nature would deliver in a 7 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today.1you attempted to quantify in any economic or 2 monetary sense the impact on Florida of 3 Georgia's consumptive water use?1form the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today.And his answer was, nothing comes to 5 mind, no.10If the Supreme Court were to cap 11 10 georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 11 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 17 crops in the southwest part of the state. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason.16With no economic harm to speak of, 17 Florida pitches its whole case on ecological 14 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart1THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	24	falls on Georgia with Florida seeking to cap	24	
Mason & Lockhart50521economy.50522At the same time, Florida receives more53303water than it needs in normal and wet years;4and it will still continue to receive steady54and it will still continue to receive steady5and dependable flows in a drought and, in66fact, more than nature would deliver in a7drought from the Army Corps of Engineers,7Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's8another entity that was not mentioned earlier7Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's9today.6Florida had another economist,10If the Supreme Court were to cap10worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a11Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia11witness, and he won't be coming to trial to12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's11witness, and he won't be coming to trial to14academic exercise. These are real people14at any point in time resulting from any16living and working in Atlanta or growing15action on the part of Georgia.18at significant risk of economic hardship for16With no economic harm to speak of,19no good reason.12possibly do so in this case given the high20whi it wants clear and convincing evidence13harm. And while Georgia and the speculative23that there is actual injury that needs to be24mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so24tha	25	Georgia's water use and with it, Georgia's	25	where he admitted that. He was asked, have
50521economy.522At the same time, Florida receives morei you attempted to quantify in any economic or3water than it needs in normal and wet years;Georgia's consumptive water use?4and it will still continue to receive steadyGeorgia's consumptive water use?4and dependable flows in a drought and, inGeorgia's consumptive water use?6fact, more than nature would deliver in amind, no.7drought from the Army Corps of Engineers,mind, no.8another entity that was not mentioned earlierPr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's9today.If the Supreme Court were to capFlorida had another economy, but he never asked whether Florida's9economy will be put at risk; and Georgia'seconomy, but he never asked whether Florida's10If the Supreme Court were to capwitness, and he won't be coming to trial to11georgia's water use in this case, Georgiawitness, and he won't be coming to trial to12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia'stestimony, none, of any economic harm at all14academic exercise. These are real peopleHard facts and not speculation. It is also16This is why the Supreme Court demands17no good reason.Torida pitches its whole case on ecological18hard facts and not speculation. It is also20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23		THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
1economy.2At the same time, Florida receives more3water than it needs in normal and wet years;4and it will still continue to receive steady5and dependable flows in a drought and, in6fact, more than nature would deliver in a7drought from the Army Corps of Engineers,8another entity that was not mentioned earlier9today.10If the Supreme Court were to cap11Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's13economy will be harmed. And this is not an14academic exercise. These are real people15living and working in Atlanta or growing16crops in the southwest part of the state.17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at ginificant risk of economic hardship for19no good reason.20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
2At the same time, Florida receives more3water than it needs in normal and wet years;4and it will still continue to receive steady5and dependable flows in a drought and, in6fact, more than nature would deliver in a7drought from the Army Corps of Engineers,8another entity that was not mentioned earlier9today.10If the Supreme Court were to cap11Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's13economy will be harmed. And this is not an14academic exercise. These are real people15living and working in Atlanta or growing16crops in the southwest part of the state.17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at significant risk of economic hardship for19no good reason.20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins26THE REPORTING GROUP27Mason & Lockhart		50		52
2At the same time, Florida receives more3water than it needs in normal and wet years;4and it will still continue to receive steady5and dependable flows in a drought and, in6fact, more than nature would deliver in a7drought from the Army Corps of Engineers,8another entity that was not mentioned earlier9today.10If the Supreme Court were to cap11Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's13economy will be harmed. And this is not an14academic exercise. These are real people15living and working in Atlanta or growing16crops in the southwest part of the state.17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at significant risk of economic hardship for19no good reason.20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins26THE REPORTING GROUP27Mason & Lockhart				
 3 water than it needs in normal and wet years; 4 and it will still continue to receive steady 5 and dependable flows in a drought and, in 6 fact, more than nature would deliver in a 7 drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, 8 another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today. 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 11 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 crops in the southwest part of the state. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins 26 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 3 Georgia's consumptive water use? 4 And his answer was, nothing comes to 5 mind, no. 6 Florida had another economist, 7 Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's 8 economy, but he never asked whether Florida's 9 economy in the basin had gotten better or 10 worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a 11 witness, and he won't be coming to trial to 12 testify. As a result, Florida has no expert 13 testimony, none, of any economic harm to speak of, 17 Florida pitches its whole case on ecological 18 harm. And while Georgia harm alone can never 20 justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot 21 possibly do so in this case given the high 22 burden on Florida and t	1	economy.	1	you attempted to quantify in any economic or
4and it will still continue to receive steady s and dependable flows in a drought and, in 64And his answer was, nothing comes to s mind, no.6fact, more than nature would deliver in a 		-		
 and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that there is actual injury that needs to be redressed. That is the mandatory first step in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high burden on Florida and the speculative evidence it has advanced. Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so text with the oysters. After all, the THE REPORTING GROUP <	2	At the same time, Florida receives more	2	monetary sense the impact on Florida of
6fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today.6Florida had another economist, T. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or uwrse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a townse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at significant risk of economic hardship for the at significant risk of economic hardship for the no good reason.6Florida had another economist, T. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at significant risk of economic hardship for thard facts and not speculation. It is also thard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence thard facts and not speculation. It is also thard facts and florida's case begins that there is actual injury that needs to be thare there is ac	2 3	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years;	2 3	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use?
7drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, a another entity that was not mentioned earlier 9 today.7Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's 8 economy, but he never asked whether Florida's 9 economy in the basin had gotten better or10If the Supreme Court were to cap 1110If the Supreme Court were to cap 121010Worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a 1112jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 1311witness, and he won't be coming to trial to 121214academic exercise. These are real people 	2 3 4	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady	2 3 4	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to
 another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also that there is actual injury that needs to be redressed. That is the mandatory first step in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart Bason & Lockhart 	2 3 4 5	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in	2 3 4 5	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no.
 9 today, 9 economy in the basin had gotten better or 10 If the Supreme Court were to cap 11 Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia 12 jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's 13 economy will be harmed. And this is not an 14 academic exercise. These are real people 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 crops in the southwest part of the state. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 9 economy in the basin had gotten better or 9 worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a 10 witness, and he won't be coming to trial to 12 testify. As a result, Florida has no expert 13 testimony, none, of any economic harm at all 14 at any point in time resulting from any 15 action on the part of Georgia. 16 With no economic harm to speak of, 17 Florida pitches its whole case on ecological 18 harm. And while Georgia does not take the 19 position that ecological harm alone can never 20 justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot 21 bard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins 24 THE REPORTING GROUP 25 Mason & Lockhart 	2 3 4 5 6	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a	2 3 4 5 6	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist,
10If the Supreme Court were to cap10worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a11Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia11worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's11witness, and he won't be coming to trial to13economy will be harmed. And this is not an14academic exercise. These are real people14academic exercise. These are real people14at any point in time resulting from any15living and working in Atlanta or growing15action on the part of Georgia.16crops in the southwest part of the state.16With no economic harm to speak of,17And Florida is asking this Court to put them17Florida pitches its whole case on ecological18at significant risk of economic hardship for18harm. And while Georgia does not take the19no good reason.19position that ecological harm alone can never20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22burden on Florida and the speculative23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, acchartthe THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & LockhartTHE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers,	2 3 4 5 6 7	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's
11Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia11witness, and he won't be coming to trial to12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's12testify. As a result, Florida has no expert13economy will be harmed. And this is not an14academic exercise. These are real people1414academic exercise. These are real people14at any point in time resulting from any15living and working in Atlanta or growing15action on the part of Georgia.16crops in the southwest part of the state.16With no economic harm to speak of,17And Florida is asking this Court to put them17Florida pitches its whole case on ecological18at significant risk of economic hardship for18harm. And while Georgia does not take the19no good reason.19position that ecological harm alone can never20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also21hard facts and not speculation. It is also21possibly do so in this case given the high22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's
12jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's12testify. As a result, Florida has no expert13economy will be harmed. And this is not an14academic exercise. These are real people1314academic exercise. These are real people14at any point in time resulting from any15living and working in Atlanta or growing15action on the part of Georgia.16crops in the southwest part of the state.16With no economic harm to speak of,17And Florida is asking this Court to put them17Florida pitches its whole case on ecological18at significant risk of economic hardship for18harm. And while Georgia does not take the19no good reason.19position that ecological harm alone can never20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or
13economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people13testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia.16crops in the southwest part of the state. 17And Florida is asking this Court to put them 1814at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia.18at significant risk of economic hardship for 1916With no economic harm to speak of, 1720This is why the Supreme Court demands 2118hard facts and not speculation. It is also 221923that there is actual injury that needs to be 24redressed. That is the mandatory first step 251025in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so 2525in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a
14academic exercise. These are real people14at any point in time resulting from any15living and working in Atlanta or growing15action on the part of Georgia.16crops in the southwest part of the state.16With no economic harm to speak of,17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at significant risk of economic hardship for18at significant risk of economic hardship for18harm. And while Georgia does not take the19no good reason.19position that ecological harm alone can never20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also21hard facts and not speculation. It is also21possibly do so in this case given the high23that there is actual injury that needs to be23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, act Chart24THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & LockhartTHE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to
 15 living and working in Atlanta or growing 16 crops in the southwest part of the state. 17 And Florida is asking this Court to put them 18 at significant risk of economic hardship for 19 no good reason. 20 This is why the Supreme Court demands 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert
16crops in the southwest part of the state.16With no economic harm to speak of,17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at significant risk of economic hardship for18at significant risk of economic hardship for19no good reason.20This is why the Supreme Court demands18harm. And while Georgia does not take the21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart16With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the19position that ecological harm alone can never20It is also21borden on Florida and the speculative23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert
17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at significant risk of economic hardship for19no good reason.20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case beginsTHE REPORTING GROUPMason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all
17And Florida is asking this Court to put them18at significant risk of economic hardship for19no good reason.20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case beginsTHE REPORTING GROUPMason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any
18at significant risk of economic hardship for18harm. And while Georgia does not take the19no good reason.18harm. And while Georgia does not take the20This is why the Supreme Court demands19position that ecological harm alone can never21hard facts and not speculation. It is also20justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot22why it wants clear and convincing evidence21possibly do so in this case given the high23that there is actual injury that needs to be23burden on Florida and the speculative24redressed. That is the mandatory first step24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins25let's start with the oysters. After all, theTHE REPORTING GROUPMason & LockhartMason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia.
19no good reason.19position that ecological harm alone can never20This is why the Supreme Court demands19position that ecological harm alone can never21hard facts and not speculation. It is also20justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot22why it wants clear and convincing evidence21possibly do so in this case given the high23that there is actual injury that needs to be23evidence it has advanced.24redressed. That is the mandatory first step24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins25let's start with the oysters. After all, theTHE REPORTING GROUPMason & LockhartMason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of,
20This is why the Supreme Court demands21hard facts and not speculation. It is also22why it wants clear and convincing evidence23that there is actual injury that needs to be24redressed. That is the mandatory first step25in the analysis, and Florida's case beginsTHE REPORTING GROUPMason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological
 21 hard facts and not speculation. It is also 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 21 possibly do so in this case given the high 22 burden on Florida and the speculative 23 evidence it has advanced. 24 Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so 25 let's start with the oysters. After all, the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the
 22 why it wants clear and convincing evidence 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 22 burden on Florida and the speculative 23 evidence it has advanced. 24 Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so 25 let's start with the oysters. After all, the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never
 23 that there is actual injury that needs to be 24 redressed. That is the mandatory first step 25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 23 evidence it has advanced. 24 Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so 25 let's start with the oysters. After all, the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 26 Inthe analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot
24redressed. That is the mandatory first step24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so25in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart24Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high
25 in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart25 let's start with the oysters. After all, the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high burden on Florida and the speculative
THE REPORTING GROUP THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that there is actual injury that needs to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high burden on Florida and the speculative evidence it has advanced.
Mason & Lockhart Mason & Lockhart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that there is actual injury that needs to be redressed. That is the mandatory first step	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high burden on Florida and the speculative evidence it has advanced. Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that there is actual injury that needs to be redressed. That is the mandatory first step in the analysis, and Florida's case begins	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high burden on Florida and the speculative evidence it has advanced. Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so let's start with the oysters. After all, the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	At the same time, Florida receives more water than it needs in normal and wet years; and it will still continue to receive steady and dependable flows in a drought and, in fact, more than nature would deliver in a drought from the Army Corps of Engineers, another entity that was not mentioned earlier today. If the Supreme Court were to cap Georgia's water use in this case, Georgia jobs will be put at risk; and Georgia's economy will be harmed. And this is not an academic exercise. These are real people living and working in Atlanta or growing crops in the southwest part of the state. And Florida is asking this Court to put them at significant risk of economic hardship for no good reason. This is why the Supreme Court demands hard facts and not speculation. It is also why it wants clear and convincing evidence that there is actual injury that needs to be redressed. That is the mandatory first step in the analysis, and Florida's case begins THE REPORTING GROUP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	monetary sense the impact on Florida of Georgia's consumptive water use? And his answer was, nothing comes to mind, no. Florida had another economist, Dr. Phaneuf. He did look at Florida's economy, but he never asked whether Florida's economy in the basin had gotten better or worse. So Florida dropped Dr. Phaneuf as a witness, and he won't be coming to trial to testify. As a result, Florida has no expert testimony, none, of any economic harm at all at any point in time resulting from any action on the part of Georgia. With no economic harm to speak of, Florida pitches its whole case on ecological harm. And while Georgia does not take the position that ecological harm alone can never justify an equitable apportionment, it cannot possibly do so in this case given the high burden on Florida and the speculative evidence it has advanced. Mr. Perry mentioned the oysters, so let's start with the oysters. After all, the THE REPORTING GROUP

	53		55
1	oyster collapse of 2012 is what prompted this	1	and thousands of hours of research and
2	particular chapter in this long-running	2	analysis, Dr. Pine published his findings in
3	dispute. In paragraph 54 of its complaint	3	a peer-reviewed scientific journal. As the
4	Florida alleged, quote, as a result of	4	Court can see in the key excerpts I'm putting
	actions authorized by Georgia, reduced	4 5	on the screen now, Dr. Pine and his
5	freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay		
6		6	co-authors reported, we did not find
7	over the past several years precipitated a	7	correlations between Apalachicola River
8	collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster	8	discharge measures, which are flows, and our
9	fishery.	9	estimated relative natural mortality rate or
10	It turns out, your Honor, that is just	10	oyster recruitment rates.
11	not true. As laid out in our brief, a team	11	They went on to state, the overall
12	of University of Florida scientists charged	12	relationships between freshwater flows,
13	with getting to the bottom of the oyster	13	drought frequency and severity, oyster
14	collapse researched this question	14	recruitment, and harvest dynamics remain
15	extensively, relying on scientists and	15	unclear.
16	experts from multiple disciplines. These	16	In a case where Florida needs clear and
17	University of Florida scientists published	17	convincing evidence of harm, a
18	their results in a paper called The	18	contemporaneous finding by a leading Florida
19	Apalachicola Bay Oyster Situation Report in	19	oyster biologist that the relationship
20	April 2013. And I have pictured it on the	20	between freshwater flow and oyster mortality
21	screen.	21	is, quote, unclear should just about end the
22	It reported that the team had not found	22	inquiry.
23	a connection between low river flows and the	23	Now, recall that Florida had alleged in
24	2012 oyster collapse. One key member of that	24	paragraph 54 of the complaint that it was low
25	team was a University of Florida Ph.D. with	25	flows from Georgia that caused the collapse.
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	- 4		50
	54		56
1	54 advanced degrees in fisheries science and	1	56 I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his
1		1	
	advanced degrees in fisheries science and		I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his
2	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his	2	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was
2 3	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured	2 3	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in
2 3 4	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife	2 3 4	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern
2 3 4 5	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of	2 3 4 5	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement
2 3 4 5 6	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife	2 3 4 5 6	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint
2 3 4 5 6 7	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now	2 3 4 5 6 7	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this lawsuit blaming low river flows and Georgia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw the light of day. We previewed these facts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this lawsuit blaming low river flows and Georgia for the collapse.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw the light of day. We previewed these facts in our opening brief, but I want to make sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this lawsuit blaming low river flows and Georgia for the collapse. Now, Dr. Pine still wanted an answer to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw the light of day. We previewed these facts in our opening brief, but I want to make sure the Court sees this extraordinary e-mail that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this lawsuit blaming low river flows and Georgia for the collapse. Now, Dr. Pine still wanted an answer to what caused the collapse; so he kept	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw the light of day. We previewed these facts in our opening brief, but I want to make sure the Court sees this extraordinary e-mail that revealed the lengths to which Florida went to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this lawsuit blaming low river flows and Georgia for the collapse. Now, Dr. Pine still wanted an answer to what caused the collapse; so he kept researching. And after more than two years	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw the light of day. We previewed these facts in our opening brief, but I want to make sure the Court sees this extraordinary e-mail that revealed the lengths to which Florida went to keep this evidence from the Court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	advanced degrees in fisheries science and zoology. His name is Bill Pine, and his picture is on the screen. He is a tenured professor in the Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation at University of Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission had already relied on Dr. Pine's research on the Gulf surgeon, and he was now asked to join the oyster team. Dr. Pine was asked in his deposition about the research he had led as of this point in time. He was asked, at this point in April of 2013 after the report came out, have you reached any firm conclusions about the connection between oyster population dynamics and river flow? And his answer was no. Unequivocal. Six months later and with its leading University scientists saying they hadn't found a connection between low river flow and the 2012 oyster collapse, Florida filed this lawsuit blaming low river flows and Georgia for the collapse. Now, Dr. Pine still wanted an answer to what caused the collapse; so he kept	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I read that allegation to Dr. Pine at his deposition, and here is what he said. He was asked, based on all the work you've done in connection with evaluating the eastern oyster, would you agree with the statement and this is straight from the complaint that reduced freshwater inflows to the Apalachicola Bay over the past several years caused a collapse of the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery? His answer was, I don't know that. We wanted to clarify. You don't know that to be the case? I don't know that to be the case. He was asked, have you seen clear evidence, which is what's required, to support such a statement? And his answer was, again, no. So what did Florida do? It tried to make sure that Dr. Pine's research never saw the light of day. We previewed these facts in our opening brief, but I want to make sure the Court sees this extraordinary e-mail that revealed the lengths to which Florida went to

	TRIAL - October	r 31, 20	016 (Vol. I)	Florida v. Georgia
	57	1		59
1	As your Honor can see on the screen,	1	authors, plus potentially more who	were
2	while the case was pending, on December 20,	2	instructed to step off by Florida.	
3	2014, Dr. Pine sent an e-mail to the chair of	3	And Georgia's oyster expert, Dr	. Ron
4	his department at the University of Florida.	4	Lipcius, independently researched t	
5	He reported, on Thursday morning I received a	5	question and arrived at the same a	
	call from a colleague at Florida's Fish and		Dr. Pine. Dr. Lipcius is a leader in l	
6	_	6	-	
7	Wildlife Commission as a, quote, heads-up.	7	field and is a professor at William &	-
8	The purpose of the call was to let me know	8	Virginia Institute of Marine Science.	
9	that following a meeting on Wednesday in	9	played a key role in restoring the o	
10	Tallahassee with the legal team representing	10	population in Chesapeake Bay. As	•
11	Florida in the Florida versus Georgia case	11	will explain and Florida's own docur	ments will
12	pending in the U.S. Supreme Court, that the	12	confirm, in the years preceding the	oyster
13	lead attorneys were, quote, not happy with	13	collapse, Florida allowed essentially	,
14	two manuscripts that I have in journal review	14	unlimited fishing of the oyster bars	with
15	on oyster populations in Apalachicola Bay.	15	virtually no enforcement of size	
16	He said, I was told by my FWC colleague that	16	restrictions. Record numbers of oy	sters were
17	the attorneys thought the paper should be	17	pulled from the bay causing concer	
18	withdrawn. And if they were published, they	18	Florida officials.	J
19	could, quote, make things difficult for me.	19	I'm going to show the Court no	wa
20	He went on to note that whether the	20	document authored by Mr. Berrigar	
	attorneys working on the case like it or not,		gentleman whose video the Court v	-
21	State of Florida staff have been involved in	21	5	
22		22	And here is what Mr. Berrigan said	
23	this work since 2011, predating the lawsuit.	23	August 2012 Oyster Assessment Re	•
24	The State has also had copies of the	24	told the state officials, the standing	
25	main paper, reviewed it numerous times; and	25	of juvenile, sublegal, and market-si	ze
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP	
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart	
	58			60
1	58 many of their staff were included as	1	oysters suggest that the overall cor	
1 2		1 2	oysters suggest that the overall cor many reefs has declined substantia	ndition of
	many of their staff were included as			ndition of Ily over
2	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the	2	many reefs has declined substantia	ndition of Ily over ntinuous
2 3	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper.	2 3	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars,
2 3 4	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at	2 3 4	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the
2 3 4 5	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper.	2 3 4 5	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e
2 3 4 5 6 7	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's	2 3 4 5 6 7	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harvest	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident vas a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse th	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a nat
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so co in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident vas a tat king funds
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse th Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, express	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident vas a tat king funds
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so co in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, expre- identified it as a cause.	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident vas a lat king funds essly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so co in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, expres identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so co in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, expre- identified it as a cause.	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in 2012, and Florida's researchers couldn't find	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so co in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, expres identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident vas a lat king funds essly of arvesting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in 2012, and Florida's researchers couldn't find one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seed from the federal government, expre- identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department Commerce Governor Scott wrote, h	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of harvesting ed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in 2012, and Florida's researchers couldn't find one. Dr. Pine isn't the only scientist who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse th Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, expres identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department Commerce Governor Scott wrote, h pressures and practices were altered	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of arvesting ed to d in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in 2012, and Florida's researchers couldn't find one. Dr. Pine isn't the only scientist who came to the conclusion that low river flows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seed from the federal government, expres identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department Commerce Governor Scott wrote, h pressures and practices were altered increase fishing effort, as measured reported trips, due to the closure of	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of arvesting ed to d in f oyster
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in 2012, and Florida's researchers couldn't find one. Dr. Pine isn't the only scientist who came to the conclusion that low river flows didn't cause that collapse. Dr. Pine's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so co in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seed from the federal government, expres identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department Commerce Governor Scott wrote, h pressures and practices were altered increase fishing effort, as measured	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of arvesting ed to d in f oyster
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	many of their staff were included as co-authors until very late drafts of the manuscript when they were asked by legal staff to, quote, step off the paper. Dr. Pine concluded by saying that at issue is the perception that the work I've led undermines the State of Florida's assertion in the ongoing lawsuit that the Apalachicola oyster collapse was caused by water policy in Georgia. The Court will hear Dr. Pine's compelling testimony about this incident by video deposition. After seeing this testimony, I think the Court will agree with Georgia that this isn't how the process is supposed to work. The Supreme Court wants hard facts showing injury. And the hard fact here is simple; there is no connection between river flows and oyster mortality in 2012, and Florida's researchers couldn't find one. Dr. Pine isn't the only scientist who came to the conclusion that low river flows didn't cause that collapse. Dr. Pine's published paper was joined by six other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	many reefs has declined substantia the past two years as a result of co- harvesting from Cat Point and East concentrated and intensive harvest majority of the fishing fleet, and the excessive harvesting of sublegal oy reported that the practice of harves sublegal oysters appears to be an e of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter In fact, before it realized the litigation-driven need to blame Geo its oyster problem, Florida was so o in its position that overharvesting w major contributor to the collapse the Florida Governor Rick Scott, in seek from the federal government, expres identified it as a cause. In his letter to the Department Commerce Governor Scott wrote, h pressures and practices were altered increase fishing effort, as measured reported trips, due to the closure of harvesting in contiguous states dur	ndition of Ily over ntinuous Hole Bars, ing by the e sters. He sting extension of 2010. of 2010. of 2010. orgia for confident vas a hat king funds essly of arvesting ed to d in f oyster

	TRIAL - October	· 31, 20	016 (Vol. I)	Florida v. Georgia
	61			63
1	This led to overharvesting of illegal and	1	hired to testify in this very case.	
2	sublegal oysters, further damaging an already	2	There is no secret that construc	tion of
3	stressed population.	3	a massive reservoir and dam at the	state line
4	Florida could have protected its oysters	4	dramatically changed the landscape	e and
5	by limiting fishing and restoring the habitat	5	ecology of this region. And there is	
6	through reshelling, but greed and politics	6	dispute that dredging and other cha	
7	prevented it from taking those necessary	7	the river channel disrupted natural	
8	steps. Georgia had nothing to do with	8	Neither Georgia nor its consumption	
9	Florida's bad decision making.	9	is the cause of any of this change, a	
10	Before we leave the bay and move to the	10	Georgia is not the reason that some	
11	river, I want to mention that Florida also	11	mussels are endangered or that the	
12	alleges harm to microscopic organisms in the	12	is endangered.	
13	bay and predicts cascading harm throughout	13	We will show, relying on reports	s of the
14	the food web. Georgia's ecology expert,	14	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, that	
15	Dr. Menzie, explains in his testimony why	15	those endangered species have wea	
16	that claim is baseless and speculative.	16	repeated droughts of the last 15 ye	
17	There is no evidence of any cascading effect	17	well. But before I turn to individua	I
18	and no evidence of harm to any fish	18	species, I do want to touch on thes	e physical
19	population up the food chain in the bay,	19	changes to the river and the floodp	
20	which is what Florida predicts.	20	are far more important to the well-	being of
21	If the Court needs any more proof on	21	these species than anything Georgi	a is doing
22	this front, I will simply note that Florida	22	on this side of the border.	
23	used to have an expert, Dr. Kenneth Jenkins,	23	The most important changes, for	-
24	who was supposed to testify to harm to a wide	24	purposes, were the construction of	
25	range of fish in the bay. That testimony did	25	Woodruff Dam at the state line and	the
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP	
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart	
	62			64
1	not work out the way Florida had hoped, so	1	dredging of the river by the Army C	-
2	Dr. Jenkins became the second expert that	2	dam not only cut off habitat upstrea	am for
3	Florida dropped for trial. Florida has no	3	fish like the sturgeon; but it had a	
4	testimony on harm to fish species in the bay,	4	corrosive effect on the river, literall	-
5	and the fact that the fish in the bay are	5	lowering the riverbed so that more	
6	thriving confirms that the species down the	6	fill the river to reach the same elev	ations.
7	food chain are abundant and more than	7	And the dredging literally dug up	
8	sufficient to sustain the bay and its	8	pre-existing natural habitats. And	
9	ecology.	9	and sand left behind blocked areas	where
10	Florida's injury fares no better if we	10	floodwaters used flow.	
11	turn to the claimed harms in and along the	11	The United States Geological Su	-
12	river. Florida claims in this case that	12	catalogued this history in a formal i	• •
13	Georgia is responsible for a whole series of	13	which I will put on the screen now.	
14	alleged harms to the ecology of the river and	14	Court can see, and I will highlight h	
15	the plants and animals that live there.	15	this report was prepared not just by	-
16	Florida fails to mention that there is a long	16	federal government, but with the in	-
17	history of physical change to this basin that	17	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservatio	
18	does not involve any conduct by Georgia.	18	Commission, the Northwest Florida	
19	This history is documented in official	19	Management District, the Florida De	-
20	publications of multiple agencies of the	20	of Environmental Protection, and an	
21	federal government, in official publications	21	government agency, the Fish and V	
22	of the State of Florida, in sworn testimony	22	Service. So Florida is aware of this	
23	from Florida officials in prior litigation	23	information and, in fact, helped cor	•
24	over the same species in this case, and in	24	What this report from USGS and	
				2004
25	published work by one of the experts Florida	25	agencies state is that from 1954 to	2004,
	published work by one of the experts Florida THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	25	agencies state is that from 1954 to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	2004,

		, _	
	65		67
1	water levels declined in the nontidal reach	1	With that background, let's turn to what
2	of the Apalachicola River. Why did that	2	Florida claims is harm in the river. Florida
3	happen? Channel widening and deepening,	3	has said that Georgia's consumption is
4	which occurred throughout much of the river,	4	threatening the very existence of mussels and
5	apparently caused the declines.	5	other species in the river. The problem is
6	Now, Mr. Perry put up a chart that was	6	there's absolutely zero evidence to support
7	blue and gray; and it talked about the	7	that claim. Most notably, Florida's expert
8	decline in some of the tree species. The	8	Dr. David Allan, he did not even attempt to
9	same author of this report is Helen Light	9	determine and offers no opinion on the
		-	-
10	created the data that goes to these tree	10	population levels of the animals he claims
11	species. And they know that it's because of	11	are being harmed. He has not looked at how
12	channel widening and deepening that USGS and	12	any of those populations have changed over
13	all of these Florida agencies concluded that	13	any period of time.
14	the floodplains have diminished these tree	14	So let's focus on the mussels. There
15	populations.	15	are three endangered mussels in the
16	But let's look at a paper written by one	16	Apalachicola River. The Court might
17	of Florida's expert in this case. Mathias	17	recognize these three. These are the purple
18	Kondolf also recounted this history. At a	18	bankclimber, the Chipola slabshell, and the
19	time not long ago when Dr. Kondolf wasn't	19	fat threeridge. With regard to these three
20	serving as an expert for Florida, he	20	species of endangered mussels, Dr. Allan does
21	acknowledged that channel enlargement has	21	not know how they are actually doing in the
22	meant more flow is contained within the	21	real world and didn't attempt to find out.
			-
23	channel, lowering water levels for the same	23	Let's look at his testimony. He was
24	flows from upstream such that overflows onto	24	asked, did you do any study to determine
25	the floodplain and through the sloughs that	25	whether these three species of mussels are
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	66		68
1	66 Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and	1	68 increasing or decreasing or stable?
1		1 2	
	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and		increasing or decreasing or stable?
2	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time.	2	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population
2 3	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and	2 3	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case
2 3 4	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed	2 3 4	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water
2 3 4 5 6	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a	2 3 4 5 6	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the	2 3 4 5 6 7	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. All of these impacts were caused by Jim Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes. That just leaves one endangered muscle, the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. All of these impacts were caused by Jim Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along the river, not by Georgia, just as Florida,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes. That just leaves one endangered muscle, the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida has proof problems that may be even worse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. All of these impacts were caused by Jim Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along the river, not by Georgia, just as Florida, its regulatory agencies, and now its own	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes. That just leaves one endangered muscle, the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida has proof problems that may be even worse than its oyster problem. When Dr. Allan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. All of these impacts were caused by Jim Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along the river, not by Georgia, just as Florida, its regulatory agencies, and now its own expert had said time and again before Florida	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes. That just leaves one endangered muscle, the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida has proof problems that may be even worse than its oyster problem. When Dr. Allan decided to base his entire mussel study on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. All of these impacts were caused by Jim Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along the river, not by Georgia, just as Florida, its regulatory agencies, and now its own expert had said time and again before Florida decided to sue Georgia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes. That just leaves one endangered muscle, the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida has proof problems that may be even worse than its oyster problem. When Dr. Allan decided to base his entire mussel study on the fat threeridge mussel, he didn't realize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and for shorter periods of time. So let's flip back now to that USGS and Florida survey which explains what happens when the channel is widened and the riverbed is lowered. As a result of this as a consequence of this decreased inundation, the quantity and quality of floodplain habitats for fish, mussels, and other aquatic organisms have declined. And wetland forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of the floodplain are changing in response to drier conditions. And this is a key statement, and we will return to it throughout this case. Water level decline caused by channel change is probably the most serious anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. All of these impacts were caused by Jim Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along the river, not by Georgia, just as Florida, its regulatory agencies, and now its own expert had said time and again before Florida	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	increasing or decreasing or stable? His answer. I did not do any population studies on these three species. That is a stunning admission in a case where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water consumption on the theory that the mussels are in peril. In fact, for two of these three endangered species pictured on the screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence that Georgia caused them any harm. He admitted in his deposition and will admit here in court that he has no evidence Georgia did anything to harm either the purple bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell was, quote, not vulnerable to water level changes. That just leaves one endangered muscle, the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida has proof problems that may be even worse than its oyster problem. When Dr. Allan decided to base his entire mussel study on

	TRIAL - October	r 31, 20		eorgie
	69		71	
1	that research sponsored by the U.S. Fish and	1	dire predictions have not come to pass.	
2	Wildlife Service had found millions more fat	2	And Dr. Allan is in no position to	
3	threeridge mussels than were previously	3	contradict Fish and Wildlife's finding that	
4	thought to exist in the Apalachicola River.	4	there are millions of these in Florida, and	
5	Yet, Florida advances Dr. Allan to say that	5	that the population is stable and doing well.	
6	the Supreme Court should find that they are	6	As the Court can see on the screen, Dr. Allan	I
7	on the brink of a catastrophe.	7	was asked, do you have any idea how many	fat
8	As your Honor can see on the screen, in	8	threeridge mussels currently reside in the	
9	a report released by U.S. Fish and Wildlife	9	Apalachicola River Basin?	
10	Service less than one month ago I just	10	His testimony, I do not.	
11	want to point out this was released several	11	So Dr. Allan claims Georgia is killing	
12	weeks ago in October the Service reported	12	the fat threeridge, but he doesn't even know	
13	that there's 10 times the suitable habitat	13	how many there are or whether the population	
14	than previously thought to exist; and it	14	is growing or shrinking. And he has no	
15	offered the following conclusions: Based on	15	explanation for why the federal government i	is
16	these densities and the area of habitat	16	finding millions of these creatures when his	-
17	mapped in each river reach, current estimates	17	analysis predicts their demise. This is not	
18	of the population size of fat threeridge in	18	the clear and convincing evidence of harm	
19	the action area range from about 6 million to	19	that Justice Cardozo had in mind.	
20	18,650,000 individuals with a mean of	20	Let's turn now to the Gulf surgeon,	
21	approximately 12 million.	21	which Florida has also claimed is being	
22	In fact, after two major droughts in	22	harmed. Dr. Allan, once again, has no idea	
23	2006 and 2008 2011, the Fish and Wildlife	23	how many there are or how they are doing.	Δs
24	Service reported in that report just a few	24	I show on the screen, he was asked, do you	/ (5
25	weeks ago that considering the recent	25	have any information about the change in	
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	23	THE REPORTING GROUP	
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart	
	70		72	
1	70 information, the fat threeridge population in	1	72 nonulation of the Gulf sturgeon over any	
1	information, the fat threeridge population in	1	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any	
2	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be	2	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time?	
2 3	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are	2 3	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no.	
2 3 4	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the	2 3 4	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has	
2 3 4 5	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers.	2 3 4 5	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's	
2 3 4 5 6	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these	2 3 4 5 6	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The	
2 3 4 5 6 7	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey	2 3 4 5 6 7	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts	5,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chann	s, nel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought over a decade ago says nothing about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chanr and every other argument Florida has made,	s, nel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought over a decade ago says nothing about the overall viability or population of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chann and every other argument Florida has made, here is what the Service concluded. It said	s, nel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought over a decade ago says nothing about the overall viability or population of the species.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chanr and every other argument Florida has made, here is what the Service concluded. It said that it characterizes the overall status of	s, nel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought over a decade ago says nothing about the overall viability or population of the species. Florida has been predicting irreparable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chann and every other argument Florida has made, here is what the Service concluded. It said that it characterizes the overall status of the species as stable and the status of the	s, nel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought over a decade ago says nothing about the overall viability or population of the species. Florida has been predicting irreparable harm to these mussels for years, and their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chanr and every other argument Florida has made, here is what the Service concluded. It said that it characterizes the overall status of the species as stable and the status of the Apalachicola River system population as	s, nel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information, the fat threeridge population in the action area appears stable and may be increasing in size. Fat threeridge are abundant in the Middle Apalachicola and the Lower Chipola Rivers. Florida realizes how difficult these facts are for its case. So to try and convey that there has been harm caused by Georgia, Florida's direct testimony points principally not exclusively, but principally not exclusively, but principally to a single mortality event for the fat threeridge that took place a decade ago in 2006 in a location called Swift Slough. We will show in this trial that Georgia had nothing to do with what happened at Swift Slough but, more importantly, the mussel population figures in this 2016 report from Fish and Wildlife showed that the localized death of mussels in a single disconnected slough during a severe drought over a decade ago says nothing about the overall viability or population of the species. Florida has been predicting irreparable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	population of the Gulf sturgeon over any period of time? His answer was no. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has answers though. They weighed in, and it's not good for Florida's case either. The Service has recognized, as Florida itself has said in the past, that it was the construction of Jim Woodruff Dam above all else that changed the sturgeon's habitat and caused it to become endangered. Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't build that dam, and Georgia didn't disrupt the sturgeon's habitat. But Fish and Wildlife also looked at the sturgeon population itself. And, again, just last month, the Service issued its 2016 biological opinion. And in that document, which takes into account the recent droughts Army Corps operations, changes to the chann and every other argument Florida has made, here is what the Service concluded. It said that it characterizes the overall status of the species as stable and the status of the	s, nel

		31, 20	D16 (Vol. I) Florida v. Geor
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	73 stable. And it was their biological opinion that the Corps' proposed changes in the new Water Control Manual will not jeopardize the continued existence of the Gulf sturgeon and will not destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. The sturgeon became endangered because a massive dam was built in the middle of its habitat, and the Army Corps dredged the river. Georgia did not cause that harm. And the federal experts charged with protecting the surgeon undermined Florida's claim that the sturgeon is under present threat of harm. One final point on the river. Throughout its brief and its written direct and again today, Florida suggests that all of the species all of them in or along the Apalachicola River are at risk due to Georgia's water consumption. The truth is that Florida has zero expert analysis and no data to support that suggestion. In fact, they haven't even attempted to study it. Let's go back to Dr. Allan's deposition where he admitted again and again and I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	75 spent so much time criticizing it. Let me start with the two major categories of water use in Georgia, municipal and industrial, and agricultural. Before I do that though, I would like to take a step back and look at the total amount of water that Georgia consumes compared with the amount of water in the ACF system. First is a chart that I put up at the beginning of my remarks showing annual average flows at the state line. As I mentioned earlier, this shows that Florida receives the overwhelming majority of water in the basin. Now, I know Florida is sitting over there saying that annual data is unfair because it masks the impacts of seasonality in dry months; so we'll show you that, too. The next slide shows monthly average flows versus Georgia consumption, and the picture is the same. Florida gets the vast majority of the water. Now, this chart underscores really the absurdity of Florida's new request made for the first time two weeks ago in Dr. Sunding's
	put it on the screen. You haven't studied		
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	25	new testimony, to impose a cap on Georgia in THE REPORTING GROUP
1	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	74		76
1	74	1	70
1	any hird species?	1	
1	any bird species?	1	average and wet years. As this chart clearly
2	No.	1 2 3	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the
	No. You haven't studied any amphibian	2	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those
2 3	No.	2 3	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no
2 3 4	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species?	2 3	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those
2 3 4 5	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No.	2 3 4 5	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come
2 3 4 5 6	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species?	2 3 4 5 6	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence requires judgment for Georgia. Equitable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000 cfs regardless of how much Georgia consumes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence requires judgment for Georgia. Equitable balancing is only conducted once that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000 cfs regardless of how much Georgia consumes. That is why Florida's obsessive focus on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence requires judgment for Georgia. Equitable balancing is only conducted once that threshhold burden has been met. While it has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000 cfs regardless of how much Georgia consumes. That is why Florida's obsessive focus on stream gage data on Flint tributaries and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence requires judgment for Georgia. Equitable balancing is only conducted once that threshhold burden has been met. While it has not been satisfied here, I will nonetheless	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000 cfs regardless of how much Georgia consumes. That is why Florida's obsessive focus on stream gage data on Flint tributaries and the Flint itself is so misplaced. Even if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence requires judgment for Georgia. Equitable balancing is only conducted once that threshhold burden has been met. While it has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000 cfs regardless of how much Georgia consumes. That is why Florida's obsessive focus on stream gage data on Flint tributaries and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	No. You haven't studied any amphibian species? No. Reptile species? No. Mammal species? No. So as the Court reads and hears testimony about the rich biodiversity of the Apalachicola region and how Georgia is placing that entire ecosystem at risk, please remember that after three years of litigation and with no fewer than 20 experts on their side Florida has no scientific evidence and no expert testimony to support that claim. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, Florida's failure to prove injury and causation by clear and convincing evidence requires judgment for Georgia. Equitable balancing is only conducted once that threshhold burden has been met. While it has not been satisfied here, I will nonetheless address Georgia's water use since Florida has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	average and wet years. As this chart clearly shows, Florida already gets virtually all the water in nondrought years. A cap in those years would clearly punish Georgia with no possible benefit for Florida. But I'll come back to that later. I want to go one step further. And even looking at 2012, one of the driest years on record, when Georgia's consumption was at its peak and rainfall was at its lowest, Georgia's consumptive use is still small compared to the amount of water flowing into Florida. The blue is the total amount that actually flowed into Florida. Now, regardless of the weather or the hydrologic conditions, Florida receives the overwhelming percentage of water in the basin. And when natural inflows decline in a drought, the Army Corps supplements with releases from its reservoirs to deliver 5,000 cfs regardless of how much Georgia consumes. That is why Florida's obsessive focus on stream gage data on Flint tributaries and the Flint itself is so misplaced. Even if streamflow were to drop in the Flint, Florida

		- /	
	77		79
1	would not feel the impact of that at the	1	statement today, Florida barely mentions
2	state line during a drought. The Flint is	2	water use in the Atlanta metro region.
3	just one piece of an integrated, managed	3	That's a major retreat from Florida's
4	water system operated by the Army Corps of	4	complaint, and it didn't happen by accident.
5	Engineers. Florida has a built-in insurance	5	Discovery has shown that the Atlanta
6	policy in the Corps, and a cap on Georgia	6	metro region is an outstanding steward of
7	would do nothing to increase that minimum	7	water recognized by the Environmental
	flow in drought while imposing significant	8	Protection Agency and other organizations for
8			
9	pain on Georgia. That is why Georgia	9	its conservation and efficiency. The metro
10	overwhelmingly bears the risk in this case.	10	district has imposed some of the most
11	And to look at this from a slightly	11	aggressive conservation measures in the
12	different perspective, we will show at trial	12	country, including conservation pricing, leak
13	that Florida loses far more water on its side	13	abatement, incentives to install high
14	of the border than Georgia could possibly	14	efficiency fixtures for municipal and
15	consume within its borders. USGS gage data	15	industrial use. In fact, the Georgia
16	shows that Florida's contribution to	16	Stewardship Act of 2010 imposed a residential
17	streamflows in the Apalachicola has	17	ban on outdoor watering between the hours of
18	diminished by 4,000 cfs, meaning that	18	10 a.m. and 4 p.m.; and Georgia imposed a
19	Florida's contributions to Apalachicola	10	complete ban on outdoor watering in Metro
	-		
20	streamflow over the last 40 years have shrunk	20	Atlanta during the 2007-2008 drought.
21	from 20 percent of total flow to just 8	21	Those are just examples. The list goes
22	percent. Florida has no explanation for its	22	on and on.
23	reduced contributions to streamflow and has	23	These measures have had a significant
24	produced no evidence in discovery that it has	24	positive impact on overall water consumption
25	done anything to research it or reverse this	25	in Atlanta. Atlanta has seen decreases in
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
_			
	78		80
1		1	80 per capita water consumption and even in
1	trend. Their strategy instead has been to	1	per capita water consumption and even in
2	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army	2	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these
2 3	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn.	2 3	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown
2 3 4	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's	2 3 4	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region.
2 3 4 5	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are	2 3 4 5	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart
2 3 4 5 6	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is	2 3 4 5 6	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per
2 3 4 5	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the	2 3 4 5	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per
2 3 4 5 6	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic	2 3 4 5 6	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of
2 3 4 5 6 7	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the	2 3 4 5 6 7	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it appears that Florida has all but given up on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor watering ban when conditions warrant. Doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it appears that Florida has all but given up on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor watering ban when conditions warrant. Doing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it appears that Florida has all but given up on its efforts to claim that M & I use in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor watering ban when conditions warrant. Doing anything more would be astronomically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it appears that Florida has all but given up on its efforts to claim that M & I use in Atlanta is causing harm to Florida. In its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor watering ban when conditions warrant. Doing anything more would be astronomically expensive and would generate little to no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	trend. Their strategy instead has been to file lawsuits blaming others; first the Army Corps, and now it's Georgia's turn. Now, I will turn to Georgia's stewardship of this resource, which we are proud to defend. Stewardship in Georgia is important because Georgia has experienced the same challenging weather and hydrologic patterns that Florida seems to think only affect Florida. Georgia has seen droughts of increasing frequency and increasing lengths, just like Florida. And it has also seen wetter winters and drier summers, just like Florida. But Georgia has made significant investments to address those challenges and to promote conservation, and I'm going to turn to those now. Let us start with the metro district in the Atlanta region, which has a record of conservation that should be the envy of any municipality on Florida's side. In fact, it appears that Florida has all but given up on its efforts to claim that M & I use in Atlanta is causing harm to Florida. In its pretrial brief and, again, in its opening	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	per capita water consumption and even in overall water consumption. And these decreases have come as population has grown dramatically in the region. As the Court can see in this chart prepared by our M & I expert Peter Mayer, per capita use has plummeted from 155 gallons per capita per day to less than 100, a drop of more than 35 percent. Even more striking, Mr. Mayer's testimony will show that total consumptive water use has also remained generally flat and, in fact, slightly declined over the same period, even as Atlanta's population grew. The reason is that metro Atlanta's conservation efforts have worked. And while Florida suggests Atlanta can do more in terms of leak abatement or outdoor watering, the fact is that Atlanta has already aggressively addressed leaky pipes and already has strict drought rules that call for an outdoor watering ban when conditions warrant. Doing anything more would be astronomically expensive and would generate little to no streamflow benefit for Florida.

		01, 20	· · ·
	81		83
1	Maybe that's why Florida for the third	1	growing exponentially, as Florida alleges.
2	time dropped the expert they hired to	2	It is also important to remember that
3	criticize Georgia's M & I water use and	3	before Atlanta can use any water from the
	-		-
4	conservation efforts. His name was John	4	federal reservoirs, it must seek approval
5	Dracup. And like Dr. Jenkins on the fish and	5	from the Army Corps. Georgia has made those
6	Dr. Phaneuf on the economy, Florida is not	6	requests. And after careful study and
7	bringing Dracup to trial either.	7	consultation with Fish and Wildlife, the Army
8	Now, I want to pause for a moment to	8	Corps has repeatedly concluded that its
		_	
9	highlight one of the more surprising	9	federal reservoirs have sufficient capacity
10	statements in Florida's pretrial brief.	10	to provide the Atlanta region with its
11	Florida claims on page 17 of its brief that	11	requested water supply and any other project
12	Georgia's M & I consumption in Atlanta will	12	purposes, including the protection of
13	continue to grow significantly unless steps	13	endangered species in Florida.
14	are taken to limit future consumptions. And	14	With its claims about water use in metro
15	Florida takes figures out of Georgia's	15	Atlanta in deep trouble, Florida spends the
16	pending water supply request with the Army	16	majority of its pretrial brief and, again,
17	Corps to suggest Georgia's water consumption	17	its opening statement today focusing on
18	in the Atlanta area will increase by 70	18	irrigation in southwest Georgia. Florida
19	percent by 2050.	19	will, we suspect, spend most of this trial
	Florida knows that there is a		
20		20	trying to establish that Georgia's irrigation
21	fundamental difference between water	21	is excessive and should be capped. Florida
22	consumption and water withdrawal. The	22	is wrong on that, too. Most water used for
23	figures Florida cites in its brief are	23	irrigation comes from groundwater pumped from
24	withdrawal numbers. And we don't want the	24	the Upper Floridan Aquifer. It is a highly
25	Court to be confused. They don't take into	25	rechargeable aquifer, which means that when
23	THE REPORTING GROUP	23	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	82		84
	02		
1	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns	1	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the
1 2		1	
2	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it	2	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and
2 3	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream	2 3	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up
2 3 4	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users.	2 3 4	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States.
2 3 4 5	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor,	2 3 4 5	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the
2 3 4	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that	2 3 4	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia
2 3 4 5	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor,	2 3 4 5	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the
2 3 4 5 6	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that	2 3 4 5 6	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia
2 3 4 5 6 7	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water	2 3 4 5 6 7	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. Mnd I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. Mnd I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. Mnd I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. Mnd I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows better than to pass off withdrawal numbers as consumption. Florida's own expert,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose picture is on the screen, in the late 1990's EPD began to focus intently on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. Mnd I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows better than to pass off withdrawal numbers as consumption. Florida's own expert, Dr. Sunding, testified that Atlanta's water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose picture is on the screen, in the late 1990's EPD began to focus intently on the relationship between irrigation pumping and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows better than to pass off withdrawal numbers as consumption. Florida's own expert, Dr. Sunding, testified that Atlanta's water use is, quote, largely nonconsumptive.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose picture is on the screen, in the late 1990's EPD began to focus intently on the relationship between irrigation pumping and riverflows. Modeling results Director Reheis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows better than to pass off withdrawal numbers as consumption. Florida's own expert, Dr. Sunding, testified that Atlanta's water use is, quote, largely nonconsumptive. Consumptive use in Atlanta for M & I is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose picture is on the screen, in the late 1990's EPD began to focus intently on the relationship between irrigation pumping and riverflows. Modeling results Director Reheis had seen were concerning to him; but he also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows better than to pass off withdrawal numbers as consumption. Florida's own expert, Dr. Sunding, testified that Atlanta's water use is, quote, largely nonconsumptive. Consumptive use in Atlanta for M & I is not THE REPORTING GROUP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose picture is on the screen, in the late 1990's EPD began to focus intently on the relationship between irrigation pumping and riverflows. Modeling results Director Reheis had seen were concerning to him; but he also THE REPORTING GROUP
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. If the Court would look at its monitor, we show a chart prepared by Mr. Mayer that compares withdrawals and returns. The combined green and blue show how much water was withdrawn from the system in metro Atlanta. The blue portion, the overwhelming majority is what was returned. As the Court can see from this chart, only a small portion of the water withdrawn is actually consumed and not returned. And I would just note that achieving return flows at these levels is not cheap. Georgia's municipalities have invested billions in this technology for the benefit of downstream users. Florida knows all this, and it knows better than to pass off withdrawal numbers as consumption. Florida's own expert, Dr. Sunding, testified that Atlanta's water use is, quote, largely nonconsumptive. Consumptive use in Atlanta for M & I is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	it rains, it quickly refills. That makes the Floridan very productive for irrigation and very different from the aquifers that dry up in the western part of the United States. And let me address head-on the allegation that Florida has made that Georgia officials have sat idly by and allowed this natural resource to be squandered. That is emphatically wrong, and it is an insult to the dedicated public servants who served as directors of the Environmental Protection Division in Georgia. Three of those directors who led the division for most of the last 20 years will come to this courtroom to testify. They will describe the steps they took to manage this resource in the southern part of the state, including the numerous conservation programs and measures that Georgia adopted over this time frame. Beginning with Harold Reheis, whose picture is on the screen, in the late 1990's EPD began to focus intently on the relationship between irrigation pumping and riverflows. Modeling results Director Reheis had seen were concerning to him; but he also THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

		1 01, 2	
	85		87
1	knew the data on groundwater at that time was	1	requirements on irrigation equipment, which
2	incomplete, and the models he was using were	2	happened, and launched a series of studies
3	rudimentary and of questionable validity.	3	aimed at increasing water supply and reducing
4	He didn't sit idly by though; he took	4	streamflow impacts. That 2012 moratorium on
5	action. As we put on the screen, during his	5	new permits remains in place today; and there
6	tenure, he imposed a moratorium on new	6	is no reasonable prospect it will be lifted,
7	permits, persuaded the general assembly to	7	putting to rest some of Florida's more dire
8	pass the Flint River Drought Protection Act.	8	predictions that agriculture is growing
9	He conducted two auctions to take acreage out	9	unchecked on the Georgia side of the line.
10	of irrigation during the '01-'02 drought.	10	Mr. Perry also played a video of
11	And he initiated a sound science study to get	11	Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, and I just want to
12	better data and to develop better models.	12	briefly note that when Mr. Caldwell said that
13	To build support for his initiatives, he	13	the sustainable yield criteria in his reports
14	did write memos warning of dire consequences;	14	had been breached, we're going to come back
15	and Mr. Perry showed a few of them. He even	15	and show the Court exactly what those
16	said, the Flint may go dry. Mr. Reheis will	16	criteria were and show the Court that they
	acknowledge that he engaged in a bit of		-
17		17	had no impact on flows in the Flint or at the
18	overstatement to drive support for his	18	state line.
19	initiatives. And the Flint River has never	19	Georgia has engaged in good stewardship
20	come close to going dry.	20	of the resource, stewardship that recognizes
21	And while Mr. Perry did put up a number	21	the ecology, but also recognizes it must be
22	of Mr. Reheis's documents, he didn't show the	22	balanced with a vibrant and important
23	dates on each occasion, which generally date	23	agricultural sector. Georgia's EPD directors
24	back 15 to 20 years; and he did not mention	24	led their agency honorably and effectively,
25	what Georgia did to respond to Mr. Reheis's	25	and they will be here live to testify about
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	86		88
1	concerns or the improved data and policies	1	their efforts.
2	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those	2	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like
2 3	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos.	2 3	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was
2	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over.	2	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening,
2 3	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen	2 3	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in
2 3 4	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study	2 3 4	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening,
2 3 4 5	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen	2 3 4 5	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in
2 3 4 5 6	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study	2 3 4 5 6	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We
2 3 4 5 6 7	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that	2 3 4 5 6 7	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an historic back-to-back drought. And he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this case now prove what Georgia has argued from the outset. There is no effective remedy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an historic back-to-back drought. And he immediately realized that an irrigation auction under the Act would not work. So he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this case now prove what Georgia has argued from the outset. There is no effective remedy without the Army Corps as a party.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an historic back-to-back drought. And he immediately realized that an irrigation auction under the Act would not work. So he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this case now prove what Georgia has argued from the outset. There is no effective remedy without the Army Corps as a party. Under the Corps operating rules, water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an historic back-to-back drought. And he immediately realized that an irrigation auction under the Act would not work. So he reinstated the moratorium on new permits, led the charge to amend the Act to improve its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this case now prove what Georgia has argued from the outset. There is no effective remedy without the Army Corps as a party. Under the Corps operating rules, water conserved during drought will be stored in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an historic back-to-back drought. And he immediately realized that an irrigation auction under the Act would not work. So he reinstated the moratorium on new permits, led the charge to amend the Act to improve its effectiveness and impose efficiency	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this case now prove what Georgia has argued from the outset. There is no effective remedy without the Army Corps as a party. Under the Corps operating rules, water conserved during drought will be stored in federal reservoirs until the Army Corps comes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	concerns or the improved data and policies that Georgia adopted in response to those memos. Then Director Carol Couch took over. And I have pictured Dr. Couch on the screen as well. She drove that sound science study forward, and she used the findings from that study to develop and adopt the Flint River Basin plan of 2006. That plan created a new permitting regime that divided the region into zones designed to protect areas that had the greatest interaction between irrigation pumping and streamflows. During Dr. Couch's tenure, Georgia also aggressively expanded the use of agricultural metering equipment and took steps to better map irrigation throughout the basin. In 2012 Director Jud Turner came to EPD. Director Turner took over in the middle of an historic back-to-back drought. And he immediately realized that an irrigation auction under the Act would not work. So he reinstated the moratorium on new permits, led the charge to amend the Act to improve its	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their efforts. Now, if I may, your Honor, I would like to turn for a moment to something that was not mentioned at all in Mr. Perry's opening, the Army Corps of Engineers and its role in managing water allocation in the basin. We raised the role of the Corps at the beginning of the case in our 12(b)(7) motion. And the Court found that there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the Corps was a necessary party at that time. But the Court also said Florida would have to bear its burden of demonstrating it could obtain relief without the help of the Army Corps and the federal reservoir system. The Order denying Georgia's motion, echoing the Supreme Court's warning in Idaho versus Oregon, said that the absence of the Corps would be a double-edged sword. The hard facts in this case now prove what Georgia has argued from the outset. There is no effective remedy without the Army Corps as a party. Under the Corps operating rules, water conserved during drought will be stored in

	89		91
1	out of drought operations. If water is	1	testify that the Corps has discretion and
2	conserved on the Flint, the Corps will reduce	2	that it always uses that discretion to pass
3	releases from the reservoirs on the	3	through additional water coming in from the
4	Chattahoochee maintaining 5,000 cfs flow at	4	Flint. The data just doesn't bear that out.
5	the state line and storing water in northern	5	Dr. Shanahan's own charts show that there is
6	reservoirs until drought operations are over.	6	no correlation between increases in flows on
7	Dr. Wei Zeng, the head of Georgia EPD's	7	the Flint during drought and flows released
8	hydrology unit, he works with these rules	8	by the Army Corps at the state line.
	every day and will explain how Corps	9	Instead, the Corps maintains state line flows
9		-	
10	operations work. And Georgia's hydrology	10	at roughly 5,000 cfs while in drought
11	expert, Dr. Philip Bedient, will demonstrate	11	operations even with a spike in the Flint.
12	that a cap on Georgia will not result in	12	That's just how the system works, and those
13	additional streamflow to Florida in drought	13	are the hard facts.
14	times without a change to Army Corps	14	Florida cannot change the expert
15	procedures.	15	testimony, which brings us to the fourth
16	But maybe more importantly, as we	16	Florida expert that didn't make the cut for
17	explained in our pretrial motion, Florida's	17	trial. In addition to Dr. Shanahan, Florida
18	own hydrology expert, Dr. Hornberger, he ran	18	hired James Barton to address Army Corps
19	his own version of the Army Corps hydrology	19	operations. Mr. Barton has 30 years of real
20	model called ResSim, which stands for	20	world experience in reservoir management and
21	Reservoir Simulation. When he ran that	21	operations and, in fact, he managed
22	model, Dr. Hornberger found exactly what	22	reservoirs for the Army Corps of Engineers.
23	Georgia has said in this case.	23	He just about summed up Florida's problem
24	We'll put it on the screen. He found	24	when he was asked, if you need a predictable
25	that in drought times, the Corps stores extra	25	flow at a predictable time, you have to have
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	90		92
1	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it	1	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right?
1 2		1 2	-
	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it		the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right?
2	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen,	2	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would
2 3	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months	2 3	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it.
2 3 4	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50	2 3 4	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an
2 3 4 5	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture	2 3 4 5	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect,
2 3 4 5 6	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state	2 3 4 5 6	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of
2 3 4 5 6 7	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by anyone else. It is a fiction created to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps in federal court to compel the Corps to release more water.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by anyone else. It is a fiction created to generate a litigation outcome. It is not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps in federal court to compel the Corps to release more water. With all this history, it is clear that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by anyone else. It is a fiction created to generate a litigation outcome. It is not science, and it is not hard facts.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps in federal court to compel the Corps to release more water. With all this history, it is clear that Florida knows it needs the Corps to get any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by anyone else. It is a fiction created to generate a litigation outcome. It is not science, and it is not hard facts. Florida will respond with yet another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps in federal court to compel the Corps to release more water. With all this history, it is clear that Florida knows it needs the Corps to get any meaningful relief in this case. Florida
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by anyone else. It is a fiction created to generate a litigation outcome. It is not science, and it is not hard facts. Florida will respond with yet another expert, Peter Shanahan, who was hired to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps in federal court to compel the Corps to release more water. With all this history, it is clear that Florida knows it needs the Corps to get any meaningful relief in this case. Florida knows that it is the Corps, not Georgia, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	water in its reservoirs and does not pass it through. As we show on the screen, Dr. Hornberger found that for multiple months of drier drought years, even cuts of 50 percent of Georgia's water use in agriculture produced zero benefit to Florida at the state line. Now, Dr. Hornberger and Florida were unsatisfied with those results; so they put them in the back of its backup material and created a new model just for this litigation. That model is aptly called the Lake Seminole Model because the only reservoir it considers is Lake Seminole, the one that sits right at the border and has very little storage. And since that lake has limited storage, under his model excess water always flows through, which is exactly the result he was looking for in the first place. But that model has never been used by the Army Corps or by anyone else. It is a fiction created to generate a litigation outcome. It is not science, and it is not hard facts. Florida will respond with yet another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the Army Corps deliver that flow. Right? Answer. I don't see how else you would do it. It was this moment of candor from an experienced Army Corps manager, we suspect, that eliminated Mr. Barton from the group of Florida experts who will testify at trial. There is simply no possible way to deliver dependable and predictable minimum flow to Florida in times of drought without the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is why prior to this case, proposals to resolve this historic dispute always included changes to Army Corps operations and the management of the federal reservoirs. It is also why, until this case, Florida always sought its relief from the Army Corps, either by asking the Corps directly for more flow or by suing the Corps in federal court to compel the Corps to release more water. With all this history, it is clear that Florida knows it needs the Corps to get any meaningful relief in this case. Florida

	TRIAL - October	r 31, 20	016 (Vol. I) Flor	ida v. Georgia
	93			95
1	sets the minimum flows; and Florida knows	1	decide.	
2	that the Corps has considered the appropriate	2	The other reason the Court should b	be
3	minimum state line flow for Florida twice in	3	skeptical is that Florida keeps changing	what
4	the last five years. And both times it found	4	it is asking for. At the beginning of the	
5	5,000 cfs to be sufficient.	5	case, Florida said it wanted to cap Geor	
6	Mr. Perry flashed up the 1999 EPA	6	at 1992 levels. Now, that request is no	-
7	guidelines with specified flows that he said	7	to be found. Then Dr. Sunding served	
8	were significant. He didn't mention that	8	first expert report in February of 2016.	
9	those were never adopted. He also didn't	9	this point he had been working on the c	
		-		
10	mention that in the Army Corps and the U.S.	10	for four years. And what did he do? He	
11	Fish and Wildlife review of the recent water	11	suggested four alternatives to generate	
12	supply request, both times the Corps	12	cfs. Suddenly that number doubled to	
13	conducted an extensive process with technical	13	cfs in Dr. Sunding's next report issued j	
14	input from the States; and both times the	14	a couple of months later. When asked	-
15	Corps consulted with Fish and Wildlife, which	15	did that, Dr. Sunding had no explanatio	n
16	has now twice in the last five years issued	16	other than discussions with lawyers.	
17	biological opinions signing off on the	17	It's also important to note that	
18	Corps's minimum flows. Florida has already	18	Dr. Sunding never once, not until two w	
19	weighed in and pushed for greater flows from	19	ago, as I mentioned before, suggested	
20	the Corps at every turn because it knows that	20	on water use in nondrought years. In f	act, I
21	however this case turns out, it still needs	21	will show on the screen that Dr. Sundin	g was
22	the Army Corps if it is ever to consistently	22	asked whether there is biological harm	in the
23	receive the additional water it seeks across	23	normal and wet years? I was trying to	find
24	the state line.	24	out why he only had drought year reme	edies.
25	The final point I would like to address	25	He said, virtually all the discussions	
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP	
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart	
				96
1	94	1		96 rts
1	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's	1	that I have had with other Florida expe	rts
2	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the	2	that I have had with other Florida expe have focused on dry years. I just have	rts n't
2 3	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on	2 3	that I have had with other Florida expe have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average	rts n't
2	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level	2	that I have had with other Florida expe have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems.	rts n't or wet
2 3 4 5	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida	2 3 4 5	that I have had with other Florida expe have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ	rts n't or wet ously
2 3 4 5 6	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says	2 3 4 5 6	that I have had with other Florida expe have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ proposed before two weeks ago a cap for	rts n't or wet ously or
2 3 4 5 6 7	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what	2 3 4 5 6 7	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent w	rts n't or wet ously or vith
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federal	rts n't or wet ously or vith al
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previse proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing the	rts n't or wet ously or vith al
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues.	rts n't or wet ously or vith al :he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ proposed before two weeks ago a cap fr nondrought years. And it's consistent w what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the	rts n't or wet ously or vith al :he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the	rts n't or wet ously or with al che
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previse proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo	rts n't or wet or vith al :he :he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will	rts n't or wet or vith al :he :he rn
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of	rts n't or wet ously or with al the the the f at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federate courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach	rts n't or wet or with al che che rn put f at nicola
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federal courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to	rts n't or wet or with al che che rn put f at nicola
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federate courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inundation.	rts n't or wet or with al the the the the the the the the the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federal courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to	rts n't or wet or with al the the the the the the the the the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federate courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inundation.	rts n't or wet or with al che che che f at nicola o te n the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inunda aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain	rts n't or wet or with al che che che f at nicola o te n the n the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our opponent can pick off this menu of options to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inunda aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain significant biological processes on which	rts n't or wet or with al che che rn put f at nicola o te n the Bay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our opponent can pick off this menu of options to get to whatever consumptive use level the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previperoposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent with the florida has been telling the federate courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inundate aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain significant biological processes on which health of the river and the Apalachicola	rts n't or wet or with al the the the the the the the the the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our opponent can pick off this menu of options to get to whatever consumptive use level the Court says. In presenting the Court with that approach, Florida provides no details,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that I have had with other Florida expen- have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previ- proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing to Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of to Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inunda aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain significant biological processes on which health of the river and the Apalachicola relies. And then he goes on to say, ups consumption is not significant enough t	rts n't or wet or with al the the the the the the the the the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our opponent can pick off this menu of options to get to whatever consumptive use level the Court says. In presenting the Court with that approach, Florida provides no details, no guidance, no scientific basis to set the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previperoposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federate courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years or least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate the connect floodplain channels and inundate aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain significant biological processes on which health of the river and the Apalachicolate relies. And then he goes on to say, upse consumption is not significant enough to the screes.	rts n't or wet or with al che che che f at nicola o te n the Bay stream o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our opponent can pick off this menu of options to get to whatever consumptive use level the Court says. In presenting the Court with that approach, Florida provides no details, no guidance, no scientific basis to set the cap that it seeks or even to help this Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previperoposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federat courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inundate aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain significant biological processes on which health of the river and the Apalachicolate relies. And then he goes on to say, upse consumption is not significant enough to interfere with those processes.	rts n't or wet or with al che che che f at nicola o te n the Bay stream o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	94 in opening, your Honor, is Florida's requested remedy or, more accurately, the lack of one. Florida says it wants a cap on Georgia, but it doesn't say at what level Georgia's use should be capped. Florida says it needs more water; but it never says how much, when it's needed, or for what duration. Florida also does not explain how any remedy will actually alleviate the claimed harms. So all we are left with is a menu of options that Dr. Sunding says Georgia can implement. We understand that equitable apportionment cases are rare, your Honor; but we are not aware of any case in the history of the Republic where a party or state presented the Supreme Court with a menu of options and said, you pick the streamflow you think we're entitled to; and then our opponent can pick off this menu of options to get to whatever consumptive use level the Court says. In presenting the Court with that approach, Florida provides no details, no guidance, no scientific basis to set the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I have had with other Florida expension have focused on dry years. I just have heard any issues raised about average year problems. That's why Dr. Sunding never previperoposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent we what Florida has been telling the federate courts for years while they were suing the Army Corps on these same issues. As Doug Barr, a long-time head of the Water Management District for the Apalachicola region, testified in his swo statement in federal court, which I will on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years or least average annual flows, the Apalach River's flows are more than adequate the connect floodplain channels and inundate aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain significant biological processes on which health of the river and the Apalachicolate relies. And then he goes on to say, upse consumption is not significant enough to the screes.	rts n't or wet ously or with al the the the the the f at hicola o te n the Bay stream o

		01, 20	
	97		99
1	in 2009.	1	Dr. Allan's analysis will bring a total of 29
2	One final point on Dr. Sunding's	2	fewer low flow days to the tupelo trees.
3	evolving numbers. Not a single other expert	3	That's not very much. But when he admits on
4	on the Florida side used those numbers to see	4	the stand that it's 29 days over 16 years,
5	if those cuts would improve the environment	5	the Court might ask whether it makes any
6	or the ecology. Dr. Allan never tested the	6	sense at all to crush Georgia's farmers for
7	river species against those numbers, and the	7	an average of less than two more days at
8	bay ecology experts didn't use those numbers	8	optimal flows for the tupelo trees.
9	in their remedy scenarios. No one used those	9	The other reason the Court should be
10	numbers. It was just Dr. Sunding developing	10	very wary of Dr. Sunding's proposed cuts is
11	different ways to cut Georgia's water use	11	that they are so extreme, they would
12	with no connection to hydrologic or	12	effectively wipe out all water use in
13	biological change in the basin. Not a single	13	Georgia, both in metro Atlanta and the
14	biologist or ecologist on the Florida side	14	agricultural sector in the southwest part of
15	evaluates the impacts of those cuts in the	15	the state. And that's true even if we use
16	real world.	16	the inflated estimates of consumptive use
17	At the same time that Dr. Sunding is	17	developed by Florida's experts.
18	bouncing around with his numbers, there is	18	For example, on the agricultural side,
19	another Florida expert, Mr. Flewelling	19	Dr. Sunding now says that Georgia can cut
20	Dr. Flewelling. He's running something that	20	irrigation by 1687 cfs. But Florida's own
21	he calls a remedy scenario. I want to pause	21	groundwater expert, Dr. Langseth, he
22	on this. His remedy scenario calls for a 50	22	testified at his deposition that Georgia's
23	percent cut in agricultural irrigation every	23	maximum irrigation in the worst drought on
23	year, not to mention other restrictions he	23	record was only 1200 cfs. As the Court can
25	would place on Georgia.	25	see on the screen, if the Court accepts
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	25	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
			100
	98 The Court might see a reference in the		100 Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wing out all
1	The Court might see a reference in the	1	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all
2	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who	2	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then
2 3	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this	2 3	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some.
2 3 4	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy	2 3 4	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two
2 3 4 5	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in	2 3 4 5	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates
2 3 4 5 6	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what	2 3 4 5 6	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to
2 3 4 5 6 7	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes	2 3 4 5 6 7	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a miniscule amount that won't change a thing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of his expert report and deposition, Dr. Sunding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a miniscule amount that won't change a thing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of his expert report and deposition, Dr. Sunding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a miniscule amount that won't change a thing for the species living there.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of his expert report and deposition, Dr. Sunding said metro Atlanta could do leak abatement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a miniscule amount that won't change a thing for the species living there. And the Court will see that wiping	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of his expert report and deposition, Dr. Sunding said metro Atlanta could do leak abatement and reduce outdoor watering to generate 545
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The Court might see a reference in the testimony of Dr. Allan or Dr. Greenberg, who looks at bay salinity, and others and this is a quote to a very conservative remedy scenario. It's a little hard to follow in their testimony because it doesn't say what that scenario actually is or where it comes from. But make no mistake, their very conservative remedy doesn't come from Dr. Sunding; it comes from Dr. Flewelling. And it contemplates eliminating half of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia. If that's their conservative remedy, I would hate to see the liberal one. But what gets really interesting is what happens when the experts run this so-called conservative remedy. As the Court will see, even under the Florida expert analyses, wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture changes salinity in the bay this is under their other experts' analysis by a miniscule amount that won't change a thing for the species living there. And the Court will see that wiping out half of Georgia's agriculture under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dr. Sunding's proposal, it would wipe out all agricultural water use in Georgia and then some. Now, Florida did submit new numbers two weeks ago trying to increase their estimates of Georgia's consumption in the lead-up to trial, perhaps so the Court would have more to work with. And a number of Florida's experts filed new analyses generating even higher consumptive use numbers. Dr. Langseth was no exception, so I have put his new agriculture number on the screen, which exceeds 1400 cfs. But even with this new supercharged number from Dr. Langseth, Dr. Sunding still calls for the elimination of more water use than even Florida's experts say we use. It's the same story on the municipal and industrial front. This is a chart that shows Dr. Flewelling's estimate of M & I consumptive use in Atlanta. At the time of his expert report and deposition, Dr. Sunding said metro Atlanta could do leak abatement and reduce outdoor watering to generate 545 cfs in additional streamflow. Comparing that

		01, 2010 (
	101		103
1	to the chart that Dr. Flewelling created	1	injury, and whatever injury it claims is
2	shows that Dr. Sunding would wipe out all	2	either speculative or unconnected to anything
3	consumptive water use in Atlanta for all but	3	Georgia has done or could remedy. Under
4	two of the last 20 years.	4	Supreme Court precedent, that's where this
5	Dr. Sunding realized he had a huge error	5	case ends.
6	in his analysis that couldn't be right, so he	6	But even if the Court were to move to
7	revised his remedy number for Atlanta down to	7	equitable balancing, Georgia will demonstrate
8	315 cfs. But as the Court can see, it still	8	that Florida still has no claim because
9	wipes out most consumptive use in many years,	9	Georgia is a good steward of water. It puts
10	and half or more in most.	10	it to incredibly efficient and productive
11	And Dr. Sunding's streamflow numbers	11	use. And after four years of litigation,
12	aren't the only thing that he's changed over	12	Florida still cannot articulate how much
13	and over again. He keeps changing the amount	13	water it needs and how it gets it without the
14	he says it would cost Georgia to get those	14	Army Corps.
15	streamflows. His first report said it would	15	Accepting Florida's position would
16	cost Georgia about \$200 million to get a	16	effectively preclude any consumption of water
17	thousand cfs in streamflow in a dry year.	17	in Georgia for no perceptible gain in
18	Now, in his direct, Dr. Sunding says that	18	Florida. The Supreme Court has never done
19	Georgia can get double the streamflow for	19	anything like that before, and it should not
20	half the cost, 2,000 cfs for a hundred	20	start in this case. This case should be
21	million.	21	dismissed and judgment entered in Georgia's
22	Georgia's expert economist, Dr. Robert	22	favor.
23	Stavins, will explain that both of these sets	23	Thank you.
24	of numbers are way off. The truth is that to	24	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
25	get just 675 cfs in a dry year, Georgia would	25	I want to commend counsel, Mr. Perry,
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	25	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
			Mason & Lockhan
	102		104
	102		104
1	have to completely eliminate row crop	1	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument,
2	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year.	2	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially
2 3	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to	2 3	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75
2 3 4	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage	2 3 4	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes.
2 3 4 5	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars.	2 3 4 5	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want
2 3 4 5 6	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that	2 3 4 5 6	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do?
2 3 4 5 6 7	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and	2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their citizens, the consequences of getting this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever you're ready.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their citizens, the consequences of getting this wrong and cutting Georgia's citizens off from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever you're ready. MR. QURESHI: Thank you, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their citizens, the consequences of getting this wrong and cutting Georgia's citizens off from their water could be devastating.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever you're ready. MR. QURESHI: Thank you, your Honor. We call Mr. Jonathan P. Steverson, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their citizens, the consequences of getting this wrong and cutting Georgia's citizens off from their water could be devastating. Over this trial we will show that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever you're ready. MR. QURESHI: Thank you, your Honor. We call Mr. Jonathan P. Steverson, the Secretary for Florida's Department of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their citizens, the consequences of getting this wrong and cutting Georgia's citizens off from their water could be devastating. Over this trial we will show that Florida has not met its burden to prove	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever you're ready. MR. QURESHI: Thank you, your Honor. We call Mr. Jonathan P. Steverson, the Secretary for Florida's Department of Environmental Protection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have to completely eliminate row crop irrigation at a cost of \$335 million a year. To get to 850 cfs, there would also have to be additional significant cuts in M & I usage sending the cost up over a billion dollars. These numbers and the way that Dr. Sunding casually proposes them and changes them should be deeply troubling to the Court. They are not the minor inconveniences that Florida would have the Court believe. And they change so quickly and so dramatically it appears they are almost made up on the fly. Certainly not based on facts and science. In conclusion, Florida has failed to produce the hard facts it needs on every element. Recall what the Supreme Court said; the state needs hard facts and clear and convincing evidence because when we are dealing with sovereign states and their citizens, the consequences of getting this wrong and cutting Georgia's citizens off from their water could be devastating. Over this trial we will show that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Mr. Primis, on the quality of your argument, your opening statements, and especially because neither one of you used the full 75 minutes. Do you want to start now or do you want to go to lunch or what do you want to do? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're fine going to lunch now. We are prepared to put on a witness, too; but lunch is fine with us. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Lunch? MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can go in either direction. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, let's recess and go to lunch and come back here at 12:30. MR. PRIMIS: Sounds good. (Time Noted: 11:22 a.m.) (Recess Called) (Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Whenever you're ready. MR. QURESHI: Thank you, your Honor. We call Mr. Jonathan P. Steverson, the Secretary for Florida's Department of

	I RIAL - OCIODEI	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	105		107
1	THE CLERK: Please raise your right	1	MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor.
2	hand.	2	Might I just check with the technical
3	Do you solemnly swear that the testimony	3	people to see if we're prepared?
4	you shall give in the cause now in hearing	4	Okay. It appears now that we are.
5	shall be the truth, the whole truth, and	5	Your Honor, if I might approach, we have
6	nothing but the truth, so help you God?	6	prepared slides and videotape; but we have
7	THE WITNESS: I do.	7	also prepared binders that have the documents
8	THE CLERK: Please be seated.	8	that are addressed in the in the actual
9	If you could please state your full name	9	testimony so the Court can follow along in
10	and spell your name for the record, please.	10	the documents.
11	THE WITNESS: Sure. If it please the	11	If I might approach, what we have
12	Court, my name is Jonathan Paul Steverson.	12	endeavored to do, your Honor and this may
13	Spell it out?	13	be something that both parties embrace as a
14	J O N A T H A N, P A U L, S T E V E R S O N. Therefore	14	method for playing this throughout the
15	Thank you.	15	trial is to have a series of slides that
16	MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, if I	16	identify the document and then identify the
17	understand the process, I will now provide	17	testimony. Then we will play the testimony.
18	Secretary Steverson with a copy of his	18	Because there are perhaps 10 to 12
19	prefiled direct.	19	documents here, I want to make sure that
20	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.	20	we're walking through this at the right
21		21	place, make sure the Court can follow the
22	BY MR. QURESHI:	22	documents that are the subject matter of the
23	Q. Mr. Secretary, do you adopt the prefiled direct	23	testimony.
24	testimony that's provided to you and dated	24	So this is deposition testimony of a
25	October 26, 2016? THE REPORTING GROUP	25	gentleman named Napoleon Caldwell from the THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
			Mason & Luckhait
	106		108
1	106 A I do	1	108 Georgia Department of Natural Resources
1	A. I do.	1	Georgia Department of Natural Resources
2	A. I do.Q. Thank you.	2	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his
2 3	A. I do.Q. Thank you.MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no	2 3	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe,
2	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. 	2	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management.
2 3 4	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? 	2 3 4	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to
2 3 4 5	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. 	2 3 4 5	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell
2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no 	2 3 4 5 6 7	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background.
2 3 4 5 6	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. 	2 3 4 5 6	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts videotaped deposition excerpts. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts videotaped deposition excerpts. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. Thank 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now. So clip 2.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts videotaped deposition excerpts. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now. So clip 2. (Whereupon the video was played.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts videotaped deposition excerpts. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. Thank you. May I ask counsel to keep their voices 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now. So clip 2. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And here, your Honor, on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts videotaped deposition excerpts. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. Thank you. May I ask counsel to keep their voices up. We have an extraordinary court reporter 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now. So clip 2. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And here, your Honor, on the same document, Florida Exhibit 24, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerpts videotaped deposition excerpts. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. Thank you. May I ask counsel to keep their voices up. We have an extraordinary court reporter here who can read lips, but I have old ears. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now. So clip 2. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And here, your Honor, on the same document, Florida Exhibit 24, the witness is asked about page 3-4.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I do. Q. Thank you. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry? MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no cross-examination for Mr. Steverson. We can move to the next witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down. THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You got off easy. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. MR. PERRY: Florida would like now to play some videotaped deposition excerptsvideotaped deposition excerpts. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. Thank you. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Georgia Department of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Division. And his responsibilities, which he'll describe, include water resources management. So the first three clips we're going to play, your Honor, are just Mr. Caldwell describing his background. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Okay. Your Honor, next we're going to focus primarily on Exhibit Florida 24, which is the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Plan. Towards the end of these clips, we'll also focus on Florida Exhibit 259 briefly. And I'll say for these clips and others, in its presentation we have worked with the State of Georgia to combine the designations from both states for this testimony. So we're going to play them all now. So clip 2. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And here, your Honor, on the same document, Florida Exhibit 24, the witness is asked about page 3-4. (Whereupon the video was played.)

TRIAL - October 31, 2016 (Vol. I)	Florida v. Georgia
109	111
1MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip1clips relates to FX-4 titled	1999 Talking
2 also pertains to Florida Exhibit 24, the same 2 Points.	
3 Georgia document. And this clip relates in 3 (Whereupon the video	was played.)
4 particular to page 3-9. 4 MR. PERRY: Your Hone	or, on the same
5 (Whereupon the video was played.) 5 exhibit, Florida Exhibit 4, p	age GA 1419036.
6 MR. PERRY: And in particular, on page 6 (Whereupon the video	was played.)
7 3-9 this clip relates to table 3-3. 7 MR. PERRY: Your Hone	
8 (Whereupon the video was played.) 8 is, likewise, about Florida B	
9 MR. PERRY: And here in particular, on 9 the page number that's the	
10 the last of the three rows on that page. 10 the clip is GA 1419039.	, ,
11 (Whereupon the video was played.) 11 (Whereupon the video	was played.)
12 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next page, 12 MR. PERRY: Your Honor	
13again, in Florida Exhibit 24, is page 3-6,13clips deal with Florida Exhi	
14and in particular, table 3-1.14you can see on this page,	
15(Whereupon the video was played.)15Mr. Napoleon Caldwell to t	
16 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the following is 16 Mr. Harold Reheis, of the E	
10111213141414141417additional testimony on that same topic and17Protection Division of Geor	
	-
19 (Whereupon the video was played.) 19 MR. PERRY: The next 19 MR. PERRY: Vaur Hanar, this particular 20 Elerida Exhibit 19	-
20 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, this particular 20 Florida Exhibit 18. And in	•
21 clip is about the same topic, but also 21 text of that e-mail at GA 9 22 complexe EV Elevide Evides 20	
22 employs FX Florida Exhibit 259. 22 (Whereupon the video	
23 (Whereupon the video was played.) 23 MR. PERRY: Your Hone 24 MR. PERRY: Your Hone 24 Hone	
24 MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of 24 Honor, this clip relates to t	nat same e-mail
25clips addresses a proposal regarding25at Florida Exhibit 18.THE DEPORTING OPOLID	
THE REPORTING GROUP THE REPORTING	
Mason & Lockhart Mason & Lockhart	
110	112
1 consumptive use budgets in Georgia and 1 (Whereupon the video	
2sustainability. It involves Florida2MR. PERRY: Your Hone	-
3 Exhibit 65 and then also Florida Exhibit 109. 3 Exhibit 18, on the second	
4 (Whereupon the video was played.) 4 exhibit, that page is numb	
5MR. PERRY: Again, testimony regarding5(Whereupon the video	
6 Florida Exhibit 65. 6 MR. PERRY: Your Hone	
7(Whereupon the video was played.)7of clips relate to a file proc	luced from
8 MR. PERRY: And here, your Honor, the 8 Napoleon Caldwell's histori	
9 testimony focuses on Florida Exhibit 65, page 9 Georgia. It's Florida Exhib	•
40 CA 1674E	it 16. And you
10GA 16745.10will see a file folder, and the	it 16. And you nen the clips
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the	it 16. And you nen the clips
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the next clip12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video was played.)	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.)
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video was played.)14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video was played.)	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video vide	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of Georgia	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of Georgia	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of Georgia	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of Georgia	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.)
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of G	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.) or, the next clip,
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of G	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.) or, the next clip, Exhibit 16.
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the video was played.)12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video vide	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.) or, the next clip, Exhibit 16. in the same file
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of G	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.) or, the next clip, Exhibit 16. in the same file
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of G	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular ment in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.) or, the next clip, Exhibit 16. In the same file II. And the page
11(Whereupon the video was played.)11will examine and discuss the12MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip12folder.13is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in13(Whereupon the video14particular a slide in that exhibit which is14MR. PERRY: Your Honor15numbered GA 126762.15testimony is about a docur16(Whereupon the video was played.)16It relates to an issue near17MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same17coast of Georgia where a coast of G	it 16. And you nen the clips ne contents of that was played.) or, this particular nent in that file. the Atlantic consumption cap was was played.) or, the next clip, Exhibit 16. In the same file II. And the page

	113		115
1	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, this clip has to	1	GA 1120386.
2	do with the same exhibit, Florida Exhibit 16.	2	(Whereupon the video was played.)
3	And it's a later page of the same document,	3	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip
4	GA 477298.	4	relates to Joint Exhibit 69.
5	(Whereupon the video was played.)	5	(Whereupon the video was played.)
6	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, still on Florida	6	MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, the next
7	Exhibit 16, a little bit farther in the	7	clip is about the same document, JX-69. And
8	document, the page number is GA 477308.	8	it focuses on page GA 208715 at the bottom of
9	(Whereupon the video was played.)	9	that first page.
10	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of	10	(Whereupon the video was played.)
11	clips relates to Florida Exhibit 66, which is	11	MR. PERRY: The next clip, your Honor,
12	a PowerPoint presentation created by the	12	deals with a 1995 study at Florida Exhibit 36.
13	witness Napoleon Caldwell entitled The Link	13	It's a study conducted by Georgia Department
14	Between Science and Policy in Water	14	of Natural Resources Wildlife Resources
15	Management in Georgia, the Flint River Basin	15	Division in Georgia.
16	Experience.	16	(Whereupon the video was played.)
17	(Whereupon the video was played.)	17	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip
18	MR. PERRY: In here, your Honor, again	18	relates also to the same document, Florida
19	in Florida Exhibit 66, testimony focuses on	19	Exhibit 36. And in particular, the page
20	GA 55244.	20	number is towards the back of that exhibit at
21	(Whereupon the video was played.)	21	GA 100752. And it relates in particular to
22	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of	22	table 3 of that page.
23	clips deals with Joint Exhibit 21, which we	23	(Whereupon the video was played.)
23	have referred to as Georgia's Flint River	24	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that is the
25	Basin Regional Water Development and	25	conclusion of the clips for Mr. Napoleon
25	THE REPORTING GROUP	25	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	Mason a Lockhart		
	114		116
1	114 Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006.	1	116 Caldwell.
1	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006.	1	Caldwell.
1 2 3	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.)	1 2 3	
2	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006.	2	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new
2 3	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21.	2 3	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
2 3 4	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.)	2 3 4	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared.
2 3 4 5	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of	2 3 4 5	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be
2 3 4 5 6	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management	2 3 4 5 6	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just
2 3 4 5 6 7	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the witness here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Theodore
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the witness here. (Whereupon the video was played.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Theodore Scott Hoehn and the last name you will not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the witness here. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: The next clip is also about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Theodore Scott Hoehn and the last name you will not get is H O E H N, as in Nancy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the witness here. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: The next clip is also about Florida Exhibit 85 and the same Napoleon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Theodore Scott Hoehn and the last name you will not get is H O E H N, as in Nancy. MS. WINE: Your Honor, as you can see,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the witness here. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: The next clip is also about Florida Exhibit 85 and the same Napoleon Caldwell 2012 memorandum. The page number is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Theodore Scott Hoehn and the last name you will not get is H O E H N, as in Nancy. MS. WINE: Your Honor, as you can see, the State of Florida is calling its next
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Conservation Plan from March 20 of 2006. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, about Joint Exhibit 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips deals with Georgia's Drought Management Plan, which is JX-161. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: That same testimony continues in this clip. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: And, your Honor, this clip, likewise, relates to Joint Exhibit 161. The particular page that's the subject matter of the clip is GA 98980. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of clips addresses Florida Exhibit 85, a memorandum written in 2012 by Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the witness here. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PERRY: The next clip is also about Florida Exhibit 85 and the same Napoleon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Caldwell. I believe we're prepared to call a new witness live at this time. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. PERRY: Or we're nearly prepared. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm going to be cross-examining the next witness. May I just take one step out to prepare and then come right back? Thank you, your Honor. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Thank you. Be seated. State your full name and spell your name for the record, please. THE WITNESS: Okay. My name is Theodore Scott Hoehn and the last name you will not get is H O E H N, as in Nancy. MS. WINE: Your Honor, as you can see,

	117			119
1	witness, which is Mr. Ted Hoehn, who is a	1		Correct?
2	senior level biologist with Florida's Fish	2	Α.	I have part of my job duties at the Fish and
3	and Wildlife Conservation Commission. He has	3		Wildlife Commission is to help coordinate the
4	been a biologist for the State of Florida for	4		review, pass that information to our internal
5	more than 30 years.	5		agency experts to have them help analyze the
6	If I may approach, I would like to hand	6		information, and then synthesize that information
7	him his prefiled direct testimony.	7		for responses back to either the relevant state
8	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.	8		agency or out to Fish and Wildlife Service or the
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION	9		Corps of Engineers.
10	BY MS. WINE:	10	0	Mr. Hoehn, I'm just reading from paragraph 57 of
11	Q. Mr. Hoehn, I have handed you what's labeled your	11	ч.	your testimony. Is it true that you are one of
12	prefiled direct testimony in this case dated, I	12		the state agency employees in Florida responsible
13	believe, October 24, 2016. Do you adopt	13		
14		14	•	for reviewing proposed actions by the Corps?
	everything in this testimony?			Yes, I am.
15	A. Yes, I do.	15	Q.	Okay. Sir, could you refer to tab 1 in the book.
16	Q. Thank you.	16		It is marked as Georgia Exhibit GX-72. Do you
17	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis?	17		see that document, Mr. Hoehn?
18	MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.	18	А.	Yes, I do.
19	Your Honor, to try and facilitate things	19		MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, to
20	and be more efficient, we have prepared a	20		facilitate, I have given hard copies, but to
21	book of exhibits that we intend to use on	21		highlight and direct the Court to the
22	cross. We provided the Court and Mr. Dunlap	22		specific pages were going to focus on, I'm
23	with a copy. And I would like to walk up and	23		going to have Mr. Smith put some of the pages
24	hand one to Mr. Hoehn, if I may.	24		up on the screen. I think it will make it
25	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.	25		easier to follow.
	THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
	118			120
1	MR. PRIMIS: May I proceed?	1		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
2	Your Honor, may I proceed?	2		MR. PRIMIS: Thank you.
3	May I begin?	3	BY I	MR. PRIMIS:
4	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes.		-	
5		4	Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you recognize this document.
-	MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, sir.	5	_	Correct?
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION	5 6	_	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS:	5 6 7	Α.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past.
7 8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a	5 6 7 8	Α.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your
7 8 9	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct?	5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct?
7 8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct.	5 6 7 8	A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your
7 8 9	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct?
7 8 9 10	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct?
7 8 9 10 11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document.
7 8 9 10 11 12	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? A. Yes, sir. 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct. The picture that appears on the screen right now,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? A. Yes, sir. Q. And you're familiar with the plant and animal 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct. The picture that appears on the screen right now, that is the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? A. Yes, sir. Q. And you're familiar with the plant and animal species there? 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct. The picture that appears on the screen right now, that is the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? That is correct. It's taken from the catwalk on
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? A. Yes, sir. Q. And you're familiar with the plant and animal species there? A. Yes, I am. 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct. The picture that appears on the screen right now, that is the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? That is correct. It's taken from the catwalk on the eastern side of the river or the dam.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? A. Yes, sir. Q. And you're familiar with the plant and animal species there? A. Yes, I am. Q. You're also one of the people at Fish and 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct. The picture that appears on the screen right now, that is the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? That is correct. It's taken from the catwalk on the eastern side of the river or the dam. Mr. Hoehn, the Jim Woodruff Dam is the one that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PRIMIS: Q. Mr. Hoehn, Ms. Wine said that you were a biologist for the State of Florida. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you have spent your career studying the Apalachicola River and the species that live there. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. You have observed the river, its tributaries, and sloughs. Right? A. Yes, I have. Q. And the floodplain? A. Yes, sir. Q. And you're familiar with the plant and animal species there? A. Yes, I am. Q. You're also one of the people at Fish and Wildlife who has been responsible for reviewing 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct? Yes. It's one that was a PowerPoint that I produced for something in the past. Okay. And this document was produced from your files. Correct? As far as I can recall, yes. And you had a role in creating this document. Correct? Yes, I did. Okay. The title of the document is Apalachicola River Damage. Do you see that? Yes. And that's the title you put on it? That is correct. The picture that appears on the screen right now, that is the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? That is correct. It's taken from the catwalk on the eastern side of the river or the dam. Mr. Hoehn, the Jim Woodruff Dam is the one that sits at the Florida-Georgia border. Correct?

-		TRIAL - October	<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		121			123
1	Q.	And Lake Seminole sits behind it?	1	Α.	It's a historical photo.
2	Α.	That's correct.	2	Q.	Now, with the chart and the vertical line, the
3	Q.	It's where the Apalachicola River begins?	3		yellow bars just to the right of it, they go
4	Α.	Currently, yes.	4		down. Correct?
5		Okay. And in the ACF Basin, water coming from	5	Α.	That is correct.
6		Georgia goes through this dam that's here on the	6	Q.	And that is showing a decline in the level of the
7		screen before it becomes the Apalachicola River.	7		riverbed after the building of Jim Woodruff Dam.
8		Correct?	8		Correct?
9	^	Currently that is correct.	9	^	That's correct. And this is typical of any dam
		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I want to direct you to another	-	л.	
10	α.		10		that is constructed; you will have this change in
11		slide in this presentation. Let's go to page 3.	11	~	the riverbed.
12		And we can put it on the screen. The title	12		And Jim Woodruff Dam is no exception. Right?
13		for this slide is Damage in the Upper River. Do	13		It's no exception.
14		you see that?	14	Q.	Now, the first bullet point on damage in the
15	Α.	Yes, sir.	15		upper river says, the down-cutting of the channel
16	Q.	And you're talking about the Apalachicola River	16		5 feet. Do you see that?
17		in this in this page. Right?	17	Α.	Correct.
18	Α.	That is correct.	18	Q.	And what that means is that the riverbed has been
19	Q.	Okay. And the chart on the right shows a change	19		lowered 5 feet. Correct?
20		in water levels at the Chattahoochee Gage from	20	Α.	That's correct.
21		1938 to 1998. Correct?	21	Q.	And it also means
22	Α.	That is correct.	22	Α.	At the time that this was developed, that's what
23	Q.	And when it says Chattahoochee, that's referring	23		it was.
24		to the gage which actually sits on the Florida	24	Q.	And this was developed at approximately 2006.
25		side of the border. Right?	25		Correct?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
-					
		122			124
1	Δ	122	1	Δ	124 I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was
1		That is correct.	1	Α.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was.
2	Q.	That is correct. And just	2	А.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to
2 3	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam.	2 3		I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred.
2 3 4	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial,	2 3 4		I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut
2 3 4 5	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through	2 3 4 5		I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone	2 3 4 5 6	Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. Q.	That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? Correct. And that vertical line was put there to show</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	<pre>That is correct. And just And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	<pre>That is correct. And just And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? Correct. And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	<pre>That is correct. And just And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? Correct. And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct? That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? Correct. And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct? Correct. And And a copy just for your information, the</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct? That's correct. And it also reduces populations of valued species
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? Correct. And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct? Correct. And And a copy just for your information, the preceding picture is one showing when it was</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct? That's correct. And it also reduces populations of valued species when you have a down-cutting of the river channel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct? Correct. And a copy just for your information, the preceding picture is one showing when it was actually being constructed.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct? That's correct. And it also reduces populations of valued species when you have a down-cutting of the river channel like that. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? Correct. And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct? And a copy just for your information, the preceding picture is one showing when it was actually being constructed. Thank you, Mr. Hoehn.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct? That's correct. And it also reduces populations of valued species when you have a down-cutting of the river channel like that. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	<pre>That is correct. And just Just downstream of the lock and dam. Right. And since this is the first day of trial, I'm going to do a little more stepping through these points so that I can make sure everyone understands exactly where things are. So that Chattahoochee Gage is measuring the water that has actually come across the border through the Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct? Yes. It it measures the water that comes through the dam and yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct? And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct? Correct. And a copy just for your information, the preceding picture is one showing when it was actually being constructed.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I really couldn't tell you exactly when it was. I would have had to look at the exact file as to when it occurred. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, with the channel being down-cut by 5 feet, that means it takes more water to get to the same depth of the river. Correct? That's correct. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True? It caused as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right? Correct. You're not saying it's not damaged? No. Okay. I'm just saying it requires more water. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct? That's correct. And it also reduces populations of valued species when you have a down-cutting of the river channel like that. Correct?

		125			127
1		here are those that require some of the spring	1		consider it, is approximately Blountstown, the
2		runs that are immediately downstream of where the	2		city of Blountstown.
3		dam is and are also referred to in the upper	3	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, let's look at the next slide of
4		reach as part of the map that is in my direct	4		your slide deck. Let's go back to that one.
5		testimony.	5		MR. PRIMIS: And, Matt, this would be Georgia
6	Q.	One of the species that has a reduced population	6		Exhibit you have it, good 72.
7		because of the down-cutting of the channel just	7	BY I	MR. PRIMIS:
8		south of the dam is the Gulf sturgeon. Correct?	8	Q.	Okay. So now, we're looking at the next page of
9	Α.	That's correct.	9		your presentation. We're still in the upper
10	Q.	And in addition to needing more water to fill the	10		river. Correct?
11		channel to the same height, your presentation	11	Α.	That's correct.
12		makes the point that more water is needed to	12	_	And this one is entitled Destruction of Channel
13		reverse existing damage and prevent additional	13		and Riparian Areas. Right?
14		harm. Would you agree with that?	14	Δ.	The title of this one is Channel and Riparian
15	А.		15	7.1	Areas. But what I'm going to say is this is not
16	Q.		16		related to just the upper river. The upper river
17	~	testimony. And I would like to put that up on	17		had very minimal changes and dredging and sand
18		the screen right now. Do you have your direct	18		deposition.
19		testimony?	19	0	Okay. You have called this slide Destruction of
20	Δ	Yes, I do.	20	ч.	Channel and Riparian Areas. Correct?
21	Λ.	MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, do you have a	21	Δ	That's correct.
22		copy of that?	22		And when you say riparian areas, you mean the
23		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes.	23	પ્ય.	floodplain. Right?
23		MR. PRIMIS: You know what; we're going	23 24	٨	No. Actually, I'm meaning the areas adjacent to
25			24 25	~ .	the river.
25		to put it on the screen, so we'll see it. THE REPORTING GROUP	25		THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		126			128
1		Matt, this is from his direct testimony,	1	0	Okay. And the first bullet says one form of the
2		table map 5.	2	α.	destruction of the channel is channelization. Do
3		There it is.	3		you see that?
4		MR. PRIMIS:	4	٨	That's correct.
5	-	Now, Mr. Hoehn, this map that we have depicted on	4 5		Can you explain what channelization means.
6	α.	the screen, it breaks the river up into different	6	Q. A.	Back in the 1940's when the Congress authorized
7			7	~ .	-
8	Α.	segments. Correct? That is correct.	8		the modern navigation channel, they basically set out that there would be a 100 foot wide by 9 foot
9	Q.	And those impacts those damaging impacts you	9		deep channel. And then in the 1960's '50's
10	α.	were just describing on your PowerPoint, those	9 10		-
11					and '60's, those plans were actually developed. And so the channelization is those designs by
12		are in the part marked upper reach on your map.	11 12		,
12	А.	Correct? That's correct.	12		which the Corps then developed the modern navigation channel.
13	-	Okay. So if	13	0	And channelization has the effect of making the
14	Q. A.	But it is not the entire upper reach.	14	પ.	river wider and deeper. Correct?
15		If we expand that part I just want to let the	15	Δ	It can.
10	ખ.		10	_	And then the next bullet under Destruction of
		Court know what section we're talking about		પ.	
18		the Chattahoochee Gage is the one that sits up at	18 10		Channel and Riparian Areas says, dredging and
19 20	٨	Lake Seminole just south of there. Correct?	19 20	٨	sand disposal. Correct?
	Α.	That's correct. It's labeled as a looks like	20 21	_	That is correct.
21	0	kind of an orange triangle.	21 22	પ.	Now, a minute ago you said that dredging and sand
22	Q.		22		disposal was more of an issue in the middle river
23		on the bottom all the way up to the Lake	23 24	٨	than the upper river?
24	٨	Seminole. Correct?	24 25		Middle and upper.
75	Α.	Correct. And river mile 80, for the way we	25	પ.	Okay.
25					
25		THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart			THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

		TRIAL - Octobe	131, 2	J16 (V	/ol. I) Florida v. Georgia
		129			131
1	Α.	It has occurred, you know, in various locations;	1		MR. PRIMIS: And I would like to ask
2		but the vast majority of any of the dredging	2		Mr. Smith to blow that up.
3		occurred in roughly three areas. And they	3	BY	MR. PRIMIS:
4		received, you know, the probably 80 percent of	4	Q.	Now, this photograph shows the Army Corps
5		all the dredging and all the dredging activities,	5		personnel digging up the river and putting sand
6		you know, throughout the entire time. And those	6		on the side. Correct?
7		were approximately right at Blountstown, right at	7	Α.	That's correct. The exact location of it I can't
8		approximately mile just south of	8		remember. Most of the time this had to be a
9		the Wewahitchka Gage, which is about mile 40, and	9		very old photo because most of the time they
10		then a little bit further south than that in what	10		primarily used what is called a hydraulic dredge,
11		we call the Orley Slough reach. Those received	11		which means it literally took the sand and the
12		the vast majority of where disposal activities	12		water mixture, put it into a big pipe, which then
13	~	occur, and it's very limited.	13		went up to wherever it is they needed to put the
14	Q.	,,,,,,	14		material. And then the water and sand mixture
15		questions I'm asking you. Your counsel will have	15		was then placed in the designated disposal site
16		an opportunity to ask you follow-up questions.	16		with the appropriate boundaries on the upper and
17		So	17		lower end. And they were, in fact, required to
18	Α.	I'm trying to give you a full answer, sir.	18		have berms that would prevent it from going into
19	Q.	I understand, sir.	19		the floodplain.
20		So dredging and sand disposal. Dredging is	20	Q.	Sand disposal was not a good thing for the river.
21		when the Army Corps actually goes in and digs up	21		Correct?
22		part of the river. Correct?	22	Α.	That's why the State of Florida finally, after
23	Α.	Correct.	23		since 1979 to 2005 finally ended it.
24	Q.	And sand disposal is when it leaves the sand on	24	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, sand disposal from dredging changes
25		the side of the river that is dug during the	25		the habitat from highly productive ones to one of
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		130			132
1		dredging Correct?	1		132
1	Δ	dredging. Correct?	1		the least productive habitats in the main
2	А.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations.	2	Δ	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct?
2 3	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river.	2 3	А.	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats,
2 3 4	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is	2 3 4	A.	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had
2 3 4 5	A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but	2 3 4 5		the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000.
2 3 4 5 6	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan	2 3 4 5 6		the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps	2 3 4 5 6 7		the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q . BY	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q . BY	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q . BY	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. BY I Q.	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Α.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the riparian areas, and that's why you included it on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q . BY I Q . A .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play the video of Mr. Hoehn at 108, 12 to 21.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the riparian areas, and that's why you included it on your chart here; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Q. A. Q.	<pre>the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play the video of Mr. Hoehn at 108, 12 to 21. (Whereupon the video was played.)</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the riparian areas, and that's why you included it on your chart here; is that correct? That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q . A . Q .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play the video of Mr. Hoehn at 108, 12 to 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the riparian areas, and that's why you included it on your chart here; is that correct? That is correct. Now, there is a photograph here on destruction of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q . A . Q .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play the video of Mr. Hoehn at 108, 12 to 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the riparian areas, and that's why you included it on your chart here; is that correct? That is correct. Now, there is a photograph here on destruction of channel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q . A . Q .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play the video of Mr. Hoehn at 108, 12 to 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	dredging. Correct? At very specific designated, permitted locations. It is not willy-nilly anywhere along the river. Starting in pardon me if I my memory is not as good as I would like it to be on this; but I believe it is the navigation maintenance plan which was discussed and developed by the Corps with Georgia and the State of Florida. It designated specific areas that the Corps was only allowed to put material on. And even those were tightened up and you know, in fact, many of those were even eliminated from use as time went on as the State's permits got tighter and tighter. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river? It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river. And that is destructive of the channels and the riparian areas, and that's why you included it on your chart here; is that correct? That is correct. Now, there is a photograph here on destruction of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q . A . Q .	the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct? When sand was fresh sand was put on habitats, that is what it did. However, we have not had any disposal activities since roughly 2000. Mr. Hoehn MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to? MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct? Yes. You testified under oath? Do you have a I'll give you a copy. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to do a video impeachment. I'm happy to give him the transcript, but if I can play the video SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, sure. MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, could you play the video of Mr. Hoehn at 108, 12 to 21. (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS:

		133			135
1	Α.	That is what I did. That's correct.	1		go through the lock, but tracking some of the
2	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, one of now, going back to your	2		sturgeon that the State of Georgia would then
3		chart	3		monitor to see whether or not they would, in
4		MR. PRIMIS: We can take that picture	4		fact, go back up to their natal grounds on the
5		off.	5		Flint River.
6	BY	MR. PRIMIS:	6		That was done this year. I have not seen the
7		one in fact, one other form of destruction	7		results. But it is an ongoing effort that we are
8		of the channel is increased erosion. Correct?	8		cooperatively working to address.
9	Α.	That's correct.	9	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, can you just focus on the questions
10	_	And one effect of increased erosion is also that	10		that I'm asking. My question for you was did the
11	·	it makes the channel deeper. Right?	11		dam block access to spawning areas that the
12	Δ	That is correct.	12		sturgeon used to use?
13		Now, each of these is caused by some form of	13	Δ	Yes, it did.
14	ч.	conduct by the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct?	14		Did the dam also, as you point out here, reduce
15	۸	These were all ones that were done by dredging.	15	ч.	river habitats in size and quality?
16		Okay. Now, let's go to the next slide, which you	16	Δ	Yes, it did.
17	ч.	have titled Damage in the Upper River to Biota.	17		And the dam, you point out, also reduced mussel
18		Do you see that?	18	α.	populations. Correct?
10		Correct.	10		That's correct.
20	-		20	-	
	α.	One form of damage from the conduct that we were		α.	And then the last point, the dam you would
21		just talking about is that it limits the spawning	21		agree, wouldn't you, that it also degraded the
22	•	areas for anadromous fish. Right?	22		floodplain forest?
23	-	Correct.	23	А.	Yes. In the upper part of the river; that's
24	Q.	And those are fish that need to swim up the river	24	~	correct.
25		from saltier water to spawn. Correct?	25	Q.	Now, before we move to the other parts of the
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
1	۸	134	1		136
1		They require freshwater to spawn. Correct.	1		river, the next slide the next slide in your
2		They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning	2		river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the
2 3	Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right?	2 3	Δ	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct?
2 3 4	Q. A.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct.	2 3 4	_	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct.
2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	 They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? 	2 3 4 5	_	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q. A.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6	Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf	2 3 4 5 6 7	_	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. Q.	 They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam ,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct . This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation . And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Not here. There was no dredging.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Not here. There was no dredging. Okay. So let's go to the next slide actually,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee. This current year, we have actually worked with them; and there are permits that were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct . This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Not here. There was no dredging. Okay. So let's go to the next slide actually, let's put your map back up from your testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee. This current year, we have actually worked with them; and there are permits that were looking at is it possible that we would be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct . This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation . And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Not here. There was no dredging. Okay. So let's go to the next slide actually, let's put your map back up from your testimony. And now, we're going to move to the middle and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee. This current year, we have actually worked with them; and there are permits that were looking at is it possible that we would be able to move Gulf sturgeon over the dam. And these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Not here. There was no dredging. Okay. So let's go to the next slide actually, let's put your map back up from your testimony. And now, we're going to move to the middle and lower river.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee. This current year, we have actually worked with them; and there are permits that were looking at is it possible that we would be able to move Gulf sturgeon over the dam. And these were done by handling them, not allowing them to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, atthough the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Nch so. Is yo to the next slide actually, let's put your map back up from your testimony. And now, we're going to move to the middle and lower river. MR. PRIMIS: Can we zoom in on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	They require freshwater to spawn. Correct. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right? That is correct. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True? That is correct. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon? Gulf sturgeon, shad, striped bass, several other species. But one of the things again, this is a dated presentation because while that is true, we have been working with both the State of Georgia Fish and Wildlife Commission or Georgia DNR Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Nature Conservancy and the Corps of Engineers to work to allow and manipulate the lock system in the springtime that would allow the anadromous fish to migrate through the lock system to move into Lake Seminole and out into the Flint River or Chattahoochee. This current year, we have actually worked with them; and there are permits that were looking at is it possible that we would be able to move Gulf sturgeon over the dam. And these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	river, the next slide the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct? That's correct. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct? The upper left-hand slide is the Chattahoochee shoals where the sturgeon spawn. The bottom right-hand slide is, I believe, Flat Creek, which has seen some sedimentation. And the reason both of these pictures are in your presentation is to illustrate what it looks like when the dam causes damage to areas south of the dam. Correct? This was just damage to the habitats. Again, it was not to my recollection strictly to the dam, although the dam was a significant cause. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct? Not here. There was no dredging. Okay. So let's go to the next slide actually, let's put your map back up from your testimony. And now, we're going to move to the middle and lower river.

		137			139
1		middle and lower.	1	Q.	Okay. So let's go back to the other picture.
2	BY	MR. PRIMIS:	2		And this picture shows disconnection of an
3	Q.	And, Mr. Hoehn, does that, what appears on your	3		area that might otherwise be wetted. Correct?
4		screen, look like the middle and lower river?	4	Α.	That's correct.
5	Α.	Yes, it does.	5	Q.	And
6	Q.	Okay. I want to ask you questions about this	6	Α.	And I can't tell you exactly where that
7		section of the river now. And I believe if you	7		particular picture came from.
8		go to the next page of your PowerPoint, you will	8	Q.	There's sand and debris blocking the river
9		see a slide called Damage to Middle/Lower River.	9		channel from reaching that part of the riverbank
10		Do you see that?	10		or floodplain. Correct?
11	Α.	That is correct.	11	Α.	That's correct.
12	Q.	Okay. The first form of damage you identified	12	Q.	Is this a slough, by the way?
13		here was channel down-cutting 2 feet. Correct?	13	Α.	Without without knowing exactly where the
14	Α.	That's correct.	14		picture was taken, I can't tell you. It may be.
15	Q.	Is	15		I don't know.
16	Α.	At the time that this was done, it was estimated	16	Q.	That's fine. Let's go back to the slide.
17		to about 2 feet.	17		And the third bullet we focused on says that
18	Q.	And that's additional lowering of the river in	18		one form of damage was hydrologic connectivity is
19		this section of the river. Correct?	19		greatly reduced. Correct?
20	Α.	At that point in time.	20	Α.	At the time that was correct.
21	Q.	Okay. And you point out also that another form	21	Q.	And that's what's depicted in the bottom right
22		of damage to the middle river and lower river was	22		there where the water can't reach the floodplain?
23		25 miles of riverbank converted to sand.	23	Α.	Correct.
24		Correct?	24	Q.	Let's go to the next slide.
25	Α.	That's correct.	25		This slide is also called Damage to Middle
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		138			140
1	Q.	138 And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic	1		and Lower River. Correct?
1 2	Q.		1 2	А.	
		And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic			and Lower River. Correct?
2	Α.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct?	2		and Lower River. Correct? That is correct.
2 3	Α.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct.	2 3		and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was
2 3 4	A. Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too.	2 3 4	Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new
2 3 4 5	А. Q. ВҮ	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up.	2 3 4 5	Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6	А. Q. ВҮ	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS:	2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	А. Q. ВҮ Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	А. Q. ВҮ Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А. Q. ВҮ Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А. Q. BY Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	А. Q. BY Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А. Q. BY Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with Sand Mountain you had just testified about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he was done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А. Q. BY Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with Sand Mountain you had just testified about previously, just to make sure we're talking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he was done. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А. Q. BY Q. А.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with Sand Mountain you had just testified about previously, just to make sure we're talking about the same thing, that sand is the least productive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he was done. No. Did you have something to add?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with Sand Mountain you had just testified about previously, just to make sure we're talking about the same thing, that sand is the least productive type of habitat. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he was done. No. Did you have something to add? Yes, I do. Because part one thing that and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with Sand Mountain you had just testified about previously, just to make sure we're talking about the same thing, that sand is the least productive type of habitat. Correct? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he was done. No. Did you have something to add? Yes, I do. Because part one thing that and I appreciate your going through and looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct? At this point in time, that's correct. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too. MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Yes. This is what is often called Sand Mountain. It's site 40 disposal site 40. It is where it's one of the areas that when the Corps of Engineers straightened part of the river or did what is called a bend easing, they used the old river channel and piled it all the material up into that area. It ran out of space and was no longer able to be used. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide. This bottom picture Oh, actually, before we do, that picture with Sand Mountain you had just testified about previously, just to make sure we're talking about the same thing, that sand is the least productive type of habitat. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	and Lower River. Correct? That is correct. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct? That's correct. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct? That is correct. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct? That's correct. At the time And the floodplain forest received less water? MS. WINE: Your Honor, I think the witness was still answering the question. I would just ask counsel to let the witness answer finish his answer. MR. PRIMIS: I'm sorry. I thought he was done. No. Did you have something to add? Yes, I do. Because part one thing that and

		TRIAL - October	1		rol. I) Fiolida V. Georgia
		141			143
1		all my slides here.	1		the sand that was put into these permitted
2		One thing that I must put in context here is	2		disposal sites has gone back into the system.
3		that you indicated this was probably from around	3		And as such, when it has moved off of these
4		2004, 2005 when this was done. Many of the	4		disposal sites, it has elevated the bed of the
5		effects that are depicted here are no longer	5		river. It has, by our own FWC studies produced
6		there. They have been remedied. They are not in	6		for the Corps of Engineers, indicated that we're
7		existence.	7		starting to reclaim a lot of the species that
8	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, we'll come back to that in a moment.	8		would be normally occurring on the bank of the
9		Are you done with your answer now?	9		river that had received the sand. So without
10	Α.	Yes.	10		that sand being there, the river has started
11	Q.	Okay. The floodplain forest received less water	11		to within the banks started to recover. And,
12		inundation, correct, as a result of these	12		therefore, that's why I say much of what is in
13		activities?	13		this dated presentation, the harm much of that
14	Α.	Yes.	14		harm that was attributable to the navigation
15	Q.	Okay. And less water would make it into the	15		dredging, it's nonexistent.
16	<u> </u>	floodplain because of that deeper channel.	16	Q.	
17		Correct?	17	ч.	effect of the dredging and the channelization has
18	Δ	That is correct.	18		been fixed. Correct?
19	_		19		You don't know how much?
	α.	And that harms the floodplain forest and the		•	
20		trees because they get less water when that	20	А.	I'm not an expert in that. All I can tell is
21		happens. True?	21	~	what I have seen.
22	_	Correct.	22	-	Okay. I
23	Q.	Okay. Let's go to the next slide, Harm to	23	А.	I can tell you that the three sites that
24		Valuable River Species. That's the next slide in	24		received and I'm trying to remember
25		your presentation?	25		approximately how many cubic yards; but one site
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		· · -			
		142			144
1		Yes.	1		144 was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to
1 2			1 2		
		Yes.			was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to
2	Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf	2		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to
2 3	Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct?	2 3		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind
2 3 4	Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T	2 3 4		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth
2 3 4 5	Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels.	2 3 4 5		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep.
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this	2 3 4 5 6		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this	2 3 4 5 6 7		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that? I cannot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore? Many of them are no longer present because, A, the State of Florida denied in 2005 the dredging.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that? I cannot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you would a you would an tell you would would an tell you would an tell you would any tell me that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore? Many of them are no longer present because, A, the State of Florida denied in 2005 the dredging. And as a result, between the last time it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that? To canot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore? Many of them are no longer present because, A, the State of Florida denied in 2005 the dredging. And as a result, between the last time it was dredged, which is you know, the major dredging	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that? A connot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you your understanding of the term harm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore? Many of them are no longer present because, A, the State of Florida denied in 2005 the dredging. And as a result, between the last time it was dredged, which is you know, the major dredging was somewhere in 1999, 2000 time frame, much of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that? Aconnot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you your understanding of the term harm. MR. PRIMIS: You can take the document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct? Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and E mussels. Okay. And those had all been harmed at this point in time I'll grant you that at this point in time, those had all been harmed due to the dam, channelization, and dredging. Correct? That was only part of the story because further on in this presentation towards the very end, that is where I'm also, again, talking about the fact that much of this is due to low flow conditions. And low flow conditions have a significant impact upon all of these species. Now, Mr. Hoehn, a moment ago you said that or at least you tried to give the impression that all of these problems that are identified in your slide deck have been cured. Right? They're not there anymore? Many of them are no longer present because, A, the State of Florida denied in 2005 the dredging. And as a result, between the last time it was dredged, which is you know, the major dredging	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A.	was a 1-mile long site that was roughly 100 to 200 feet wide and received close to either 100 to 200,000 cubic yards, which that's hard to kind of figure out what it is. That's about the depth of a football field, 3 foot deep. The sand on that site is now gone, and the bank has started to recover. And, in fact, there are threatened and endangered mussels that are now recovering and are coming back to that site. Let me just make sure I get a couple of points. First point is you just said that the Army Corps deposited about a football-size worth of sand at some point in the past on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct? Absolutely. Okay. And you would agree with me that you can't tell how much of the effects of that dredging and depositing of sand has been ameliorated. Correct? You can't tell me that? A connot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you your understanding of the term harm.

		145			147
1		off the screen.	1		is locally common?
2	BY I	MR. PRIMIS:	2	Α.	I would say that it is. In certain areas of the
3	Q.	Harm to species, okay?	3		river it is locally common.
4		And you testified as a 30(b)(6) witness in	4	Q.	Sir, my question was just that's what the Fish
5		this case; is that correct?	5		and Wildlife said. Correct?
6	Α.	That is correct.	6	Α.	That is what they said.
7	Q.	And you testified about harm to species.	7	Q.	Okay.
8		Correct?	8	Α.	I need to clarify something, if I may.
9	Α.	Correct.	9	Q.	Your your counsel will be asking you questions
10	Q.	And your definition of harm refers to anything	10		on redirect in just a matter of moments.
11		ranging from death to disruption of any of the	11		I know you have a lot to say. I just want to
12		requirements for the species' life cycle to	12		get through what the Fish and Wildlife Service
13		survive. Correct?	13		has said. All right, sir?
14	Α.	That sounds like what I would have said.	14		The Fish and Wildlife Service has said that
15	Q.	And as a 30(b)(6) witness for the State of	15		the population is seemingly large. Correct?
16		Florida, you testified that even if a species has	16	Α.	That is what the document says.
17		been stable or increasing, it can still be	17	Q.	And that recruitment is occurring. Correct?
18		considered harmed. Correct?	18	Α.	That is correct.
19	Α.	I believe that is probably what I said.	19		And recruitment of the population of fat
20		Okay. Now, I want to talk about the status of	20		threeridge is sustaining or growing according to
21		mussel populations in the river today. Okay?	21		the Fish and Wildlife Service; is that correct?
22	Δ.	Sure.	22	Δ.	That is correct.
23	_	You know that the Fish and Wildlife Service just	23	_	And the Fish and Wildlife Service went on to say
24	α.	released a new biological opinion. Correct?	24	α.	that although periodic drought-induced mortality
25	Α.		25		may cause some localized population declines, we
25	~ .	THE REPORTING GROUP	23		THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		146			148
1	Q.	And that came out just a few weeks ago. Correct?	1		currently consider the species' status to be
2	-	It came out roughly one month ago.	2		stable or improving. Did they say that?
3	Q.	And you have reviewed it?	3	Δ	That is correct. That's what's written.
4	-	Yes, I have reviewed it.	4		And they also said that in suitable habitat, the
5		Okay. So then you're aware that the Fish and	5	ч.	fat threeridge is common to abundant and
6	α.	Wildlife Service has said that the mussel	6		recruitment is occurring. Correct?
7		population of the fat threeridge is stable or	7	Α.	That is what the document says.
8		improving. Correct?	8	Q.	
9	Α.		9	α.	could turn there, in the second paragraph towards
10	Q.	Okay. Can you turn to Exhibit 2 or tab 2 in your	10		the middle, Fish and Wildlife has also indicated
11	α.	book.	11		its view, have they not, that based on the
12		For the record it's marked as Joint	12		densities and the area of habitat mapped in each
12		Exhibit 168. And this is the U.S. Fish and	12		river reach, current estimates of the population
13		Wildlife biological opinion on the update of	13		size of fat threeridge range from 6,009,000 to
14		the Water Control Manual which came out a few	14		18,650,000 individual mussels. Correct?
15		weeks ago. Correct?	15	۸	That is what it says. However, the State of
10	۸	-	10	Π.	
		Yes, it is.			Florida has, as recently as August, indicated to
18	પ.	Okay. Let's turn to page 113, if you would, sir.	18 10		the Fish and Wildlife Service before this came
19		MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, I will put	19 20		out and without us having reviewed the document,
20	יעם	this on the screen.	20 21		indicated to them that we had and this is our
21	-	MR. PRIMIS:	21		mussel experts within our agency as well as
22	Q.	And I want to draw your attention to the bottom	22		myself had some significant issues with some
23		paragraph starting abundance. And, Mr. Hoehn,	23		of the information that we suspected was going to
24		would you agree that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife	24		be part of this biological opinion of which
25		Service has said that the fat threeridge mussel	25		you're now quoting and also with the methodology
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart		of 27	Mason & Lockhart

		IRIAL - October	31, 20	J 16 (V	
4		in which they in fact did use			151 States Fish and Wildlife Service Correct?
1		in which they, in fact, did use.	1		States Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct?
2		And as you're highlighting here, I must point	2	-	Yes.
3		out that it is based on the area that they	3	-	And you know Mr. Kaeser. Right?
4		mapped, which is not the full range of the	4	Α.	I have met Mr. Kaeser, and he is an acquaintance.
5		Apalachicola population. And we also have	5	Q.	Now, on JX-109, this Smit paper, you had not seen
6		significant issues with how they mapped it as	6		this before your deposition. Correct?
7		well as the sampling that was done to generate	7	Α.	No, I had not.
8		these numbers.	8	Q.	And
9	Q.	So Florida disagrees with the Fish and Wildlife	9	Α.	I had talked with both Reuben, Mr. Smit, and Adam
10		Service's conclusion that there is a mean of	10		as they were developing this and had expressed
11		approximately 12 million fat threeridge. That's	11		they had given me some very basic information.
12		your testimony?	12		And I had expressed some concerns at that time
13	Α.	We disagree with the basic premise of how they	13		that they had some incorrect assumptions that
14		calculated that number. We have not calculated	14		they needed to go back and check. I do not know
15		our own numbers.	15		whether or not they ever did.
16	Q.	So you don't have another number to offer.	16		It doesn't appear that they in some of my
17		Correct?	17		readings, that they adequately addressed a lot of
18	Α.	I do not have another number to offer.	18		the concerns.
19		Okay. Now, also on page 124, the I think this	19	Q	So if I hear you correctly, you raised issues
20		is what you're talking about. The Fish and	20		about this Smit paper that Mr. Kaeser approved.
20		Wildlife Service refers to a study done by Smit	20		You made those known to Fish and Wildlife. And
21		and Kaeser. Correct?	21		
	•				then Fish and Wildlife several weeks ago
23		That's correct.	23		published its findings that did not credit your
24	Q.	Okay. And Mr. Smit, he's a graduate student or	24	•	view. Right?
25		was a graduate student at Auburn. Correct?	25	А.	I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		150		-	152
1	Α.	I believe Auburn is where he where he did his	1	Q.	Sure. You had issues with the Smit approach.
2	_	thesis.	2	_	Correct?
3	Q.	And he did research on the populations of fat	3	_	Correct.
4		threeridge mussels. Correct?	4	Q.	You raised them with Fish and Wildlife. Correct?
5	Α.	He spent roughly two, maybe two and a half years	5	Α.	That is also correct.
6		on the river.	6	Q.	And U.S. Fish and Wildlife still published its
7	Q.	His research was supervised by someone named Adam	7		biological opinion relying on the Smit and Kaeser
8		Kaeser. Correct?	8		work for counting these mussels. Correct?
9	Α.	I don't know if it was supervised; but Adam	9	Α.	That is correct.
10		Kaeser worked for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife	10		Now, what I will also point out is on
11		Service as one of their researchers.	11		page 122 of the biological opinion, they do
12	Q.	And Mr. Kaeser approved Mr. Kaeser of the U.S.	12		acknowledge our agency's concerns, our questions,
13		Fish and Wildlife Service approved Mr. Smit's	13		and the fact that we, our agency, in coordination
14		work. Correct?	14		with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, using
15	Α.	He used the work. I cannot I have no idea	15		the same mussel biologist who did the sampling
16		whether or not he approved it or not.	16		for Mr. Smit, found that, yes, what I had
17	Q.	Can you turn to tab 3 of the book we gave you.	17		suggested to Mr. Smit and Mr. Kaeser over my 30
18		And do you recognize what we have here as JX-109,	18		years worth of experience of dealing with the
19		which is the paper by Mr. Smit?	19		river as well as our mussel biologist's
20	Α.		20		experience with the river, that, in fact, some of
21		deposition.	21		our questions about the numbers, the locations,
22	Q.	And it says at the bottom that it was approved by	22		and the stability of some of their assumptions
23		a number of people. Correct?	23		were actually incorrect. And that's on the
	•	Correct.	23		second page of 122, right above table 9.4.
24	A		_ <u>~</u> +		second page of 122, fight above lable 3.4.
24 25	-		25	0	Are you finished Mr. Hoebn?
24 25	-	And one of them is Adam Kaeser of the United	25	Q.	Are you finished, Mr. Hoehn?
	-		25	Q.	Are you finished, Mr. Hoehn? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

		152	01, 20		155
		153			
1		Thank you.	1		memory of what was all in this, please.
2		Now, Mr. Hoehn, you were surprised when you	2	Q.	In particular I'm going to direct your attention
3		learned about this document at your deposition.	3		to paragraph 207, which we can put on the screen.
4		Correct?	4		Do you see the paragraph 207?
5	Α.	Yes, I was.	5	Α.	Yes. But I'm still if you will give me just a
6	-	Because your understanding was that this research	6		moment, please.
	ч.		_	~	
7		was put on hold by Auburn University due to the	7		Certainly.
8		litigation in this case. Correct?	8	А.	Okay. Yes, sir.
9	Α.	That is what Mr. Smit had told me.	9	Q.	Okay. In paragraph 207 of this complaint in
10	Q.	You thought the you thought that this	10		federal court against the Army Corps, would you
11		research scientific research was being put on	11		agree that Florida alleged the Corps is
12		hold due to litigation. True?	12		jeopardizing the continued existence of the Gulf
13	Δ	That is, again, what Mr. Smit had told me when I	13		surgeon, the fat threeridge, and the purple
	Λ.				
14	-	asked him for a copy of this.	14		bankclimber, and is adversely modifying and
15	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I want to shift gears now and	15		destroying Gulf sturgeon critical habitat in
16		turn to a new topic. You recall that Florida was	16		violation of section 7's substantive mandates.
17		involved in other litigation concerning the	17		Did Florida make that allegation?
18		threatened and endangered mussels and sturgeon	18	Α.	Florida made that allegation and let me, if I
19		that had been raised in this case. Correct?	19		may, just to verify with you once more, that this
20	Δ	That is correct.	20		document refers to the very first case in which
	_				-
21		That's called the tri-state litigation?	21		it was Alabama versus U.S. Army Corps of
22	А.	Well, there's many I go back all the way to	22		Engineers with Florida intervenors; is that
23		the original I guess pardon me for not	23		correct?
24		remembering exactly which one; but whatever one	24	Q.	It is a continuation. If you will see at the
25		started in Alabama in 1989 through where we are	25		top, this complaint was filed in September of
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		154			156
1			1		
_	~	today.		•	2005. Do you see that?
2	Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you	2		Okay. Yes.
2 3	Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation			
	Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you	2		Okay. Yes.
3	Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation	2 3		Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the
3 4		Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the	2 3 4	Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in
3 4 5		Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989.	2 3 4 5	Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document?
3 4 5 6 7	Α.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And
3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that. Maybe even later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that. Maybe even later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? I'll take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? T'II take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? T'll take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? T'II take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes. And I want to focus on the part of the this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now MS. WINE: Your Honor, he's sticking a
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? T'II take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes. And I want to focus on the part of the this complaint where Florida claimed that Corps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now MS. WINE: Your Honor, he's sticking a litigation document in front of the witness.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes. And I want to focus on the part of the this complaint where Florida claimed that Corps operations were harming endangered species in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now MS. WINE: Your Honor, he's sticking a litigation document in front of the witness. I think the witness is trying to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes. And I want to focus on the part of the this complaint where Florida claimed that Corps operations were harming endangered species in the river. Do you remember that being the claim made in this case?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now MS. WINE: Your Honor, he's sticking a litigation document in front of the witness. I think the witness is trying to SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Til take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes. And I want to focus on the part of the this complaint where Florida claimed that Corps operations were harming endangered species in the river. Do you remember that being the claim made in this case? If you will give me one moment just to refresh my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now MS. WINE: Your Honor, he's sticking a litigation document in front of the witness. I think the witness is trying to SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear you. MS. WINE: I'm sorry, your Honor. He's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to talk to you about the well, first off, the litigation you're referring to involved Florida suing the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct? That was the that was the original 1989. Okay. And that case lasted all the way up to 2009. Correct? Till take your word on that. Maybe even later. Now, can you turn to tab 4 in your binder, Mr. Hoehn. And for the record, what we have here is the State of Florida's Third Amended and Supplemental Complaint against the United States Army Corps of Engineers. It's case No. 1:90CV01331-KOB, document numbered 339 from the Northern District of Alabama. Do you see that? Yes. And I want to focus on the part of the this complaint where Florida claimed that Corps operations were harming endangered species in the river. Do you remember that being the claim made in this case?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	Okay. Yes. Would you agree that in September of 2005 the State of Florida made the allegation contained in paragraph 207 of this document? That is correct. And And the reason why I ask, sir, is that this particular case dealt with the Corps's pending change to operations and authorization of the Georgia's request for additional water. Mr. Hoehn, I'll let you talk as much as you want; but just so you know how the process works, I ask you questions. You try and answer the question I ask. And then if you have something else, your counsel can ask that. Is that okay? Do you follow? Sure. Now MS. WINE: Your Honor, he's sticking a litigation document in front of the witness. I think the witness is trying to SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

			1		
		157		^	159
1		sticking a litigation document in front of	1		Yes, it is.
2		the witness. The witness hasn't reviewed the	2	Q.	And you signed this on November 30, 2005.
3		whole document and is just trying to orient	3		Correct?
4		himself as to what litigation action this is	4		That is correct.
5		from and make sure he's on the same page	5	Q.	Okay. Let's turn to page 6 of your sworn
6		about what litigation they're talking about.	6		declaration, and let's look at paragraph 14.
7		Not being a lawyer, I think there should	7		Okay?
8		be some latitude to make sure that they're on	8		Let me know when you're there.
9		the same page.	9		I'm right there.
10		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: In my court,	10	Q.	Okay.
11		the witness will answer the question. You	11		MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, we're
12		then may add anything you want in your	12		putting up the call-outs on the screen just
13		recross.	13		to make it easier to follow; but obviously
14		MS. WINE: Yes, your Honor.	14		the document is fully accessible to you as
15		MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.	15		well.
16	ΒY	MR. PRIMIS:	16	BY	MR. PRIMIS:
17	Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, Florida in this same case also	17	Q.	You explained to the federal court here that part
18		brought a preliminary injunction. Correct?	18		of your job at the Florida Fish and Wildlife
19		Do you recall that?	19		Commission is coordinating with the U.S. Fish and
20	Α.	I I don't recall. There may have been one.	20		Wildlife Service to protect and recover species
21		If I'm allowed to look through this, they may	21		listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
22		have requested for a preliminary injunction.	22		Correct?
23	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, you filed a sworn declaration in	23	Α.	That is correct.
23	·	support of a preliminary injunction. You don't	23		And one of those species is the fat threeridge.
24 25		recall that?	24 25	ч с .	Correct?
23		THE REPORTING GROUP	23		THE REPORTING GROUP
1		Mason & Lockhart	1		Mason & Lockhart
—			1		
1		158			160
1	Δ	158 I would need to take a look exactly for what it	1	Δ	160 They were one of the two species of federal
1	Α.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it	1	Α.	They were one of the two species of federal
2	_	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was.	2	А.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the
2 3	_	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet.	2 3		They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph.
2 3 4	_	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn	2 3 4		They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you
2 3 4 5	_	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a	2 3 4 5		They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction?	2 3 4 5 6		They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7		They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps'
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute. And the answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps'
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? And the answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Mot he answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Mathe answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Mod the answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Mothe answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top? Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct. You said that to a federal court?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Mod the answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Mothe answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top? Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct. You said that to a federal court?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Nodispute there? Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top? Yes, sin. And let's take a look at what first off, let's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct. You said that to a federal court? That is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? Nod ispute there? Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top? Yes, sir. And let's take a look at what first off, let's just make sure this is, in fact, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct. You said that to a federal court? That is correct. And then your sworn testimony further told the Court that the reason Corps operations could dramatically impact the river's ecosystem was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? No dispute. And the answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top? Yes, sir. And let's take a look at what first off, let's just make sure this is, in fact, your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph. And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct? That's correct. And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said? That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities. Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct? That is correct. You said that to a federal court? That is correct. And then your sworn testimony further told the Court that the reason Corps operations could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I would need to take a look exactly for what it was. Okay. Let's turn to tab 5 5 in the booklet. And can you identify this as your Sworn Declaration in Support of Florida's Motion For a Preliminary Injunction? That is correct. And if you need to orient yourself, you can tell it's the same case by the case number at the top. Yes. Do you see that? Yes. No dispute there? No dispute there? No dispute. And the answer to your previous question is based on looking at this, yes. Okay. Now, you filed this this document, which is the same docket number I mentioned before, document 384-1. Do you see that at the top? Yes, sir. And let's take a look at what first off, let's just make sure this is, in fact, your declaration. Can you turn to page 20 and confirm that that's your signature?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	They were one of the two species of federal mussels that are listed further down in the paragraph.And you in paragraph 15 you state that you coordinated with federal agencies other than Fish and Wildlife regarding the impacts of their actions on imperiled species in the Apalachicola River. Correct?That's correct.And you had firsthand knowledge of the Corps' activities on the river. Is that what you said?That is correct. I'm familiar with the activities.Okay. And based on your firsthand knowledge, you submitted sworn testimony telling a federal court here in paragraph 15 that, quote, the Corps' operations have the potential to impact dramatically the well-being of the river ecosystem. Correct?That is correct.And then your sworn testimony further told the Court that the reason Corps operations could dramatically impact the river's ecosystem was

			.,		
		161			163
1		that, quotes, the Corps operates the upstream	1		years to provide a navigation channel. Right?
2		dams and reservoirs that release water	2	Α.	They did remove rocks in the river. That is
3		contributing to the flow of the Apalachicola	3		correct. Whether or not they were sturgeon
4		River. Correct?	4		habitat, I cannot tell you.
5	Α.	That is correct.	5	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, do you recall giving a deposition in
6	Q.	And that was your sworn testimony in federal	6		the tri-state case, the one that we're looking at
7		court?	7		right now?
8	Α.	Yes.	8	Α.	I know I gave yes.
9		Okay. Let's talk about your sworn statement as	9		After you submitted your declaration, you gave a
10	~ .	it relates to Corps operations on the Gulf	10	~ .	deposition in support of the preliminary
11		sturgeon. Can you go to page 8, and I'll direct	11	•	injunction. Correct?
12		you to paragraph 18.	12	А.	Correct.
13		You submitted sworn testimony to a federal	13		MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, may I approach?
14		court that said the Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam on	14		MR. PRIMIS:
15		the Apalachicola River completely precludes	15	Q.	I'm handing you your deposition transcript from
16		upstream Gulf sturgeon migration. Correct?	16		that case, sir.
17	Α.	Correct.	17	Α.	Okay.
18	Q.	And the Gulf sturgeon used to swim all the way	18	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, can I refer you to page 145, line 24
19		into Georgia to spawn. Right?	19		of this document, which I would also note has the
20	Α.	As far as we knew, yes.	20		same Northern District of Alabama case number.
21	Q.	But they can't do that anymore because of the	21		And it's document No. 414-3. And it's submitted
22		dam. Correct?	22		in federal court filed on March 10, 2006.
23	Α.	That is correct.	23		Mr. Hoehn, you were asked on line 23, can you
24	Q.	Now, I think we established this before; but the	24		elaborate on habitat loss?
25		Woodruff Dam causes entrenchment. Correct?	25		Your answer. Certainly. And I will be
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		162			164
1	Δ	162	1		164 specific to the Apalachicola since that is what
1	_	Correct.	1		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what
2	_	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms	2		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of
2 3	_	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam	2 3		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer
2	Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right?	2 3 4		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand
2 3 4 5	Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct.	2 3 4 5		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how	2 3 4 5 6		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to
2 3 4 5	Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct.	2 3 4 5		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how	2 3 4 5 6		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А.	specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct? Do you see the first sentence of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct? Yes, it has.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct? Do you see the first sentence of your declaration?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct? Yes, it has. Now, in addition to the Jim Woodruff Dam cutting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	<pre>specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct? Do you see the first sentence of your declaration? Yes, I do. I wanted to read just a couple of the</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct? Yes, it has. Now, in addition to the Jim Woodruff Dam cutting off the surgeon habitat and causing entrenchment,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	<pre>specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct? Do you see the first sentence of your declaration? Yes, I do. I wanted to read just a couple of the other paragraphs right before it just to</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sin. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct? Yes, it has. Now, in addition to the Jim Woodruff Dam cutting off the surgeon habitat and causing entrenchment, you would also agree that the Corps has blasted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	<pre>specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct? Do you see the first sentence of your declaration? Yes, I do. I wanted to read just a couple of the other paragraphs right before it just to Take your time.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Correct. And just to level-set again, because these terms are a bit new, entrenchment means that the dam lowers the bed of the river. Right? Correct. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right? The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away? Correct. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right? Yes, sir. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right? Correct. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct? Yes, it has. Now, in addition to the Jim Woodruff Dam cutting off the surgeon habitat and causing entrenchment, you would also agree that the Corps has blasted away part of the Gulf sturgeon's habitat over the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	<pre>specific to the Apalachicola since that is what we are here to talk about. A large percentage of the sturgeon's former habitat is no longer available to it in order to reproduce or expand its population. It was cut off by Jim Woodruff Dam. It was also blasted away over the years to provide for a navigation channel, and what is left is an extremely small fraction of what originally there was available to it. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer? Yes, I did. Let's go back to the declaration that we were looking at, if you would, sir. I want to look at paragraph 36. It's on page 14. Now, in this paragraph you indicate that you had warned the Army Corps in 2002 that operations were resulting in significant drops in the river stage. Correct? Do you see the first sentence of your declaration? Yes, I do. I wanted to read just a couple of the other paragraphs right before it just to Take your time make sure I'm clear.</pre>

		TRIAL - October	r 31, 20	016 (\	/ol. I) Florida v. Georgia
		165	1		167
1		Okay. Yes.	1	Α.	Correct.
2	Q.	Okay. Would you agree that you told a federal	2	Q.	Let's go to page 15 now, Mr. Hoehn, paragraph 38.
3		court under oath that on April 22, 2002, you	3		And this is where you indicated what I just said,
4		informed the Army Corps of your Commission's	4		which is that dead members of fat threeridge and
5		concern that Corps operations were resulting in	5		purple bankclimbers were located in areas
6		significant drops in the river stage?	6		dewatered as a result of Corps operations, most
7	Α.	That's correct.	7		recently in 2002. Correct?
8		And you also stated, based on your personal	8	Α.	Correct.
9		knowledge, under oath that while the river	9		And your view, based on what we read in
10		levels were dropping, the Corps was maintaining	10	ч х .	paragraph the paragraph earlier, was that
			11		
11 12		the level of water in upstream reservoirs,	11		those mussels were killed because Corps
	۸	including Lake Seminole. True?		٨	operations lowered the water levels. Correct? That is correct.
13		That's correct.	13	-	
14	Q.	Let's turn now to page 19 of your declaration.	14	Q.	And on that occasion you blamed the Corps for
15		And I want to direct your attention to	15		killing mussels because the Corps controls the
16		paragraph 51. I'll give you a moment to read	16		water that flows into the Apalachicola. True?
17		it.	17	А.	The Corps operations of the lock and dam
18		Have you had a chance?	18		contribute to the flow into the Apalachicola
19		Yes, sir.	19		River.
20	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, would you agree with me that you told	20	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, I want to be very precise here. Do
21		a federal court under oath that Corps reservoir	21		you agree that the Corps controls the water that
22		operations directly and adversely impact the ACF	22		comes into and flows into the Apalachicola?
23		species at areas now designated as critical	23	Α.	They control the water that they have available
24		habitat for the Gulf sturgeon?	24		to them. And of that water that is available to
25	Α.	Yes, I did.	25		them, the answer is, yes
		THE REPORTING GROUP	1		THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		166			168
1	Q.	And you stated under oath that Corps reservoir	1	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, can you
2		operations had clear impacts on the ACF species.	2	Α.	that is the amount.
3		Correct?	3	Q.	Could you refer to your deposition that I gave
4	Α.	Correct.	4		you before from the 2006 litigation.
5	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, sticking with your declaration, let's	5	Α.	Yes, sir.
6	-	turn back to paragraph 23. And I want to talk	6		I want to refer your attention to page 61. I'm
7		about mussels now. Okay?	7	•	going to read you the questions and answers, and
8		Now, in paragraph 23 you're talking about the	8		I want to know only if you gave that testimony.
9		effect of dams. Right?	9		Starting on line 23 of page 61 of your
10	Δ	Yes. I was, in fact, quoting from a U.S.	10		deposition, question. Paragraph 38 of your
11		Department of Interior document.	11		declaration, the one we were just looking at, you
12	0	Correct. And you quoted that document for the	12		refer to dead mussels in areas dewatered as a
13	હ.	proper the proposition that dams, with their	12		result of Corps operations. What Corps
		altered flow regimes and attendant reservoirs,	13		operations are you referring to?
14					
15		have caused the extirpation of 30 to 60 percent	15		Answer. Lowering the water in the
16		of the native mussel species in selected U.S.	16		Apalachicola River.
17		rivers. Correct?	17		Question. Can you elaborate on that, please?
18		That's correct.	18		Answer. The Corps controls the water that
19	Q.	And you cited that in support of a lawsuit that	19		comes into and flows into the Apalachicola.
20		Florida had filed alleging that Corps operations	20		Were you asked those questions, and did you
21	-	were adversely affecting mussels. Correct?	21	-	give those answers?
22	_	That is correct.	22		Yes, I did.
23	Q.	In fact, you submitted sworn testimony stating	23	Q.	And, Mr. Hoehn, as you indicate on page 39 of
24		that you saw dead mussels in areas dewatered as a	24		your declaration in the 2006 litigation, you
25		result of Corps operations. Correct?	25		filed your sworn declaration in support of
		THE REPORTING GROUP	1		THE REPORTING GROUP
L	_	Mason & Lockhart		_	Mason & Lockhart
	_	Page 165 tr	_	-	21 42 of 93 sheets

		169			171
1		Florida's lawsuit because you were trying to stop	1	Α.	January 31, correct.
2		the, quote, potentially disastrous effects of	2	Q.	Okay. Let's take a look at page 3 of this brief.
3		Corps operation Corps reservoir operations on	3	Α.	I'm sorry. What page, sir?
4		imperiled species in Florida. True?	4	Q.	I'm looking at page 3, if you could.
5		Is that what it says in paragraph 39, sir?	5	Α.	Okay. Thank you.
6	Α.	Paragraph 39?	6	Q.	Now, in the first full paragraph, do you see
7	Q.	Yes.	7		about five lines down there's a reference to the
8		I'm sorry. I thought you were there.	8		Hoehn declaration?
9	Α.	I'm sorry. I wasn't.	9	Α.	Yes, I do.
10		I'll ask a new question.	10	Q.	It says, see generally appendix, Exhibit B, Hoehn
11		Would you agree that at paragraph 39 of your	11		declaration. Correct?
12		sworn testimony you referred to the potentially	12	Α.	Okay. Yes.
13		disastrous effects of Corps reservoir operations	13		And that's you. Right?
14		on imperiled species in Florida?	14		That's me.
15	Α.	That is correct.	15	Q.	Okay. And your declaration is being cited for
16		MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I see it's	16		the proposition that precedes it, which says,
17		2:45. I'm at a natural break point, if you	17		Corps operations specifically harm three species
18		wanted to take the afternoon break, but I can	18		protected under the ESA: The threatened Gulf
19		also keep going. It's up to you.	19		sturgeon, the endangered fat threeridge, and the
20		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It's up to	20		threatened purple bankclimber. Do you see that?
21		you, counsel.	21	Δ.	Correct.
22		MS. WINE: Whatever works for him, I'm	22		And, in fact, your declaration was submitted to
23		fine.	23	-	support that proposition. Right?
24		MR. PRIMIS: We'll keep going, if that's	24	Α.	That's correct.
25		okay.	25		And you mentioned those same species as being
		THE REPORTING GROUP		<u> </u>	THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		170			172
1	БV				
	Вĭ	MR. PRIMIS:	1		harmed in your testimony in this case. Right?
2		MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to	1 2	А.	harmed in your testimony in this case. Right? That is correct.
2 3					That is correct.
		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to	2		
3		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now.	2 3		That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida
3 4		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record,	2 3 4		That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that
3 4 5		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also	2 3 4 5		That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support
3 4 5 6		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation.	2 3 4 5 6		That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of
3 4 5 6 7		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a	2 3 4 5 6 7		That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to
3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. BY	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. BY	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. BY	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. BY Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	 That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	 That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	 That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	 That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	 That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q . BY Q . A .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum in Support of Preliminary Injunction, and your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	 That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large degree the flows of the Chattahoochee River and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. BY Q. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum in Support of Preliminary Injunction, and your declaration states in its title that it's in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large degree the flows of the Chattahoochee River and operation of the ACF system impact flow
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q . ΒΥ Q . A . Q .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum in Support of Preliminary Injunction, and your declaration states in its title that it's in support of that motion. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large degree the flows of the Chattahoochee River and operation of the ACF system impact flow conditions on the Apalachicola River.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q . ΒΥ Q . A . Q .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum in Support of Preliminary Injunction, and your declaration states in its title that it's in support of that motion. Correct? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large degree the flows of the Chattahoochee River and operation of the ACF system impact flow conditions on the Apalachicola River. Do you see that?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q . ΒΥ Q . A . Q .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum in Support of Preliminary Injunction, and your declaration states in its title that it's in support of that motion. Correct? Yes. Okay. Let's take a look at the brief supporting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large degree the flows of the Chattahoochee River and operation of the ACF system impact flow conditions on the Apalachicola River. Do you see that? Yes, I do.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q . ΒΥ Q . A . Q .	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I would like you to turn to tab 6 of your book now. MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, for the record, tab 6 we have marked as GX-91. And it's also part of the docket in the Alabama litigation. It's document No. 383. And it is a Memorandum in Support of the Preliminary Injunction Motion. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct? That is my understanding. And do you see at the top of tab 6, it's document No. 383. Do you see that? Oh, yours may not have that. I'm sorry. Do you see how tab 6 is called the Memorandum in Support of Preliminary Injunction, and your declaration states in its title that it's in support of that motion. Correct? Yes. Okay. Let's take a look at the brief supporting the motion. Do you see this was filed in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	That is correct. Okay. Further down in that paragraph, Florida states in this brief filed in federal court that the Corps' retention of water upstream to support recreational uses and its implementation of navigation windows dewaters areas known to support Gulf sturgeon spawning activities and populations of fat threeridge and purple bankclimber. Correct? At that time that is exactly what it said. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition? Yes. Let's go to page 5, if you would, sir, the second paragraph. Do you see paragraph 2 towards the bottom? It states that the Corps controls to a large degree the flows of the Chattahoochee River and operation of the ACF system impact flow conditions on the Apalachicola River. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And it cites the federal defendant's answer to

		173	01, 20		175
1	Α.	Correct.	1		federal court that these reservoirs are operated
2	Q.	And you would agree Florida took that position in	2		in conjunction with one another as a unified
3		litigation in federal court. Right?	3		system. Right?
4	Α.	That is in part what they alleged.	4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	Okay. Let's go to page 8. I want to look at	5	Q.	And that was Florida's position in 2006. Right?
6		paragraph 7 and specifically the next to last	6		Correct.
7		sentence. It starts, as in the case of the Gulf	7		Okay. Now, I want to shift topics a bit, and I
8		sturgeon, Fish and Wildlife Service cited water	8		want to talk to you about Swift Slough. Are you
9		impoundment, dam operations, and navigation	9		familiar with Swift Slough?
10		channel maintenance as destructive to the	10	Α.	Yes, I am.
11		mussels' habitat.	11	-	Okay. You highlight Swift Slough in your direct
12		Do you see that?	12		testimony. Correct?
13	Α.	Yes, I do.	13	Α.	Correct.
14	-	And Florida took that position in litigation	14	-	You included pictures of Swift Slough?
15	~	against the Corps. True?	15		Yes.
16	Δ	Restate that.	16	_	You have pictures of yourself at Swift Slough.
17	_	Florida took that position in the litigation in	17	٩.	Correct?
18	ч.	which you filed your declaration. Correct?	18	Δ	I have many pictures of myself at Swift Slough
19	Δ	Yes.	19	<i>.</i>	and others.
20	_	Florida further argued in the next sentence that	20	0	And you submitted them to the United States
20	ч.	any adverse modification of mussel habitat would	21	ч.	Supreme Court so it could see what Swift Slough
21		likely jeopardize their continued existence.	21		looked like. Correct?
		Right?	23	^	Yes.
23 24	۸	That's Fish and Wildlife Service U.S. Fish and	23 24	-	You want this Court to know that something
24 25		Wildlife Service.	25	α.	_
25		THE REPORTING GROUP	25		important happened at Swift Slough. Right? THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		17/			176
1	0	174 Right And you understand Florida was advancing	1	Δ	176 Yes sir
1	Q.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing	1	-	Yes, sir.
2	_	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support	2	-	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the
2 3	Α.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes.	2 3	-	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your
2 3 4	A. Q.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right?	2 3 4	-	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area
2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes.	2 3 4 5	Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still	2 3 4 5 6	Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q . A . Q . BY	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q . A . Q . BY	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q . A . Q . BY Q .	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q . A . Q . BY Q . A .	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	 Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes. of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about the five dams that are on the Chattahoochee River. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage? It's about a mile south.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about the five dams that are on the Chattahoochee River. Correct? I'm talking about the reservoirs, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage? It's about a mile south. MR. PRIMIS: And I'm sorry to the court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about the five dams that are on the Chattahoochee River. Correct? I'm talking about the reservoirs, yes. Okay. And do you see at the end of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage? It's about a mile south. MR. PRIMIS: And I'm sorry to the court reporter. I said I didn't have any trick
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about the five dams that are on the Chattahoochee River. Correct? I'm talking about the reservoirs, yes. Okay. And do you see at the end of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage? It's about a mile south. MR. PRIMIS: And I'm sorry to the court reporter. I said I didn't have any trick words, but Wewahitchka qualifies. We'll get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right. And you understand Florida was advancing that position in support Yes of its case. Right? Yes. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still exist. Right? Yes, they do. This is 10 years later. Correct? Correct. And now, Florida is making the same claim about Georgia. Correct? Correct. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you understand that they're talking now about the five dams that are on the Chattahoochee River. Correct? I'm talking about the reservoirs, yes. Okay. And do you see at the end of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes, sir. Okay. So let's put up the map of the Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? Yes. If you would like and if it would assist your Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. That's the next one I have in my notes. MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your testimony. Correct? Correct. It's from page 16? Yes, sir. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. Correct? It's close, yes. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage? It's about a mile south. MR. PRIMIS: And I'm sorry to the court reporter. I said I didn't have any trick

		177		010(1	179
1		you the spelling on that one.	1	Α.	In 2006 and anytime that it is dewatered.
2	BY	MR. PRIMIS:	2	Q.	Okay. And this one in particular was July 2006.
3	Q.	Okay. And you referred to something before.	3		Right?
4		There was a picture, you said, of Sand Mountain?	4	Α.	That's correct.
5	Α.	Correct.	5	Q.	Now, I want to take a step back and talk about
6	Q.	And Swift Slough is just south of Sand Mountain.	6		some history leading up to this incident, okay,
7		Correct?	7		the one that's pictured here in paragraph 48 of
8	Α.	No. It's north.	8		your testimony.
9	Q.	It's north of Sand Mountain?	9		Can you turn to tab 7 of your book.
10	Α.	Correct.	10		MR. PRIMIS: And we don't have an
11	Q.	Now, Swift Slough is also downstream of the	11		exhibit number for this one; but for the
12		Chipola cutoff. Correct?	12		record, I'll just say it's an e-mail and
13	Α.	Correct.	13		attachments that have the Bates number
14	Q.	And the Chipola cutoff is where the Army Corps	14		FL-ACF-03671820.
15		cut out part of the Apalachicola River. The	15	BY I	MR. PRIMIS:
16		water goes over to Chipola and then comes back to	16	Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is an e-mail that you sent
17		the Apalachicola River. Correct?	17		to Gary Warren. Do you see that?
18	Α.	No.	18	Α.	Yes, it is.
19	Q.	No. What is it?	19	Q.	And Gary Warren is a colleague of yours.
20	Α.	Historically the Chipola cutoff was a natural	20		Correct?
21		part of the loop what is called a loop stream.	21	Α.	Yes. He is currently head of our what is
22		And may I explain what a loop stream is?	22		called the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.
23	Q.	You know what; the Chipola cutoff line of	23		And he is our head of the mussel program.
24		questioning was not that relevant to where I'm	24	Q.	Now, you sent this e-mail on July 18, 2006.
25		going, so let's just stay on track here. You can	25		Right?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		178			180
1		come back to it later.	1	Α.	That is correct.
2	Α.	Okay.	2	Q.	And you're forwarding an e-mail that you received
3	Q.	The Swift Slough contains mussel habitat.	3		from someone named Helen Light. Right?
4		Correct?	4	Α.	That is correct.
5	Α.	Yes, it does.	5	Q.	And the law tight is with the same the time success
6		res, it does.			And Helen Light is with the at the time was
7	Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct	6		with the United States Geological Survey.
	Q.	•	6 7	_	
8	Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct			with the United States Geological Survey.
	Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29.	7	А.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct?
8	_	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you	7 8	А.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct.
8 9	_	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough?	7 8 9	А.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named
8 9 10	_	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is.	7 8 9 10	A. Q.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife
8 9 10 11 12 13	A . BY I	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS:	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A . BY I	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	 with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A . BY I	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	 with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. BY I Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	 with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. BY I Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	 with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	А. ВҮ І Q. А.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. BY I Q. A. Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006? Yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance. Can you tell us who Helen Light is?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance. Can you tell us who Helen Light is?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006? Yes.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance. Can you tell us who Helen Light is? She was a researcher long-time researcher from USGS who has spent from the mid-'70's to the time
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006? Yes. And the reason you include this picture in your	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance. Can you tell us who Helen Light is? She was a researcher long-time researcher from USGS who has spent from the mid-'70's to the time she retired doing multiple lines of researcher
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006? Yes. And the reason you include this picture in your written direct testimony is you want to show what	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance. Can you tell us who Helen Light is? She was a researcher long-time researcher from USGS who has spent from the mid-'70's to the time
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. BY I Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	And I want to put up a picture from your direct testimony. It's paragraph 48, page 29. Okay. And is that a picture that you included of Swift Slough? Yes, it is. MR. PRIMIS: And, Mr. Smith, can you enlarge that. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. And then the caption says that this is a picture of dead mussels stranded in Swift Slough on July 3, 2006. Right? That's correct. Okay. And you took this picture. Correct? Yes, I did. On July 3, 2006? Yes. And the reason you include this picture in your written direct testimony is you want to show what it looked like when Swift Slough was dewatered	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	with the United States Geological Survey. Correct? That is correct. And she was sending a letter to someone named Jerry Ziewitz at the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Correct? That is correct. And she copied, among other people, a Mr. James Hathorn, who works at the Army Corps. Right? That's correct. And Joanne Brandt, who works at the Army Corps. Correct? Correct? Correct. Joanne Brandt was head of the before she retired, she was head of the environmental compliance. Can you tell us who Helen Light is? She was a researcher long-time researcher from USGS who has spent from the mid-'70's to the time she retired doing multiple lines of researcher

		TRIAL - October	31, Z	010 (1	
	~	181			183
1	Q.	One of the things she researched was the effect	1		requested this survey. Right?
2		of channel change on inundation of floodplains in	2	-	Correct.
3		Apalachicola. Correct?	3		And, in fact, you went on the survey. True?
4	А.	If you're referring to what I consider the green	4	-	Correct.
5		document, which I think is one of her later ones,	5	Q.	And this survey was clearly connected to your
6	-	yes.	6		prior visit where you had seen those dead mussels
7	Q.	Okay. And Ms. Light is now a consultant for the	7		three days earlier. Correct?
8		State of Florida on this case. Correct?	8	-	Correct.
9	-	She has been, yes.	9	Q.	Now, you say in the same this letter says in
10	Q.		10		the same sentence that you provided field
11		Jerry Ziewitz?	11		assistance to Ms. Light for the survey. Right?
12	А.	At the time Jerry Ziewitz was forgive me. I	12	-	Correct.
13		don't remember if he was in charge of the listed	13	Q.	So you were there when she was conducting the
14		species or section 7 group; but he is the person	14		work that actually led to this report. Right?
15 16		that I worked with throughout the Comprehensive	15 16	•	You watched it?
17		Study, the Compact, dredging issues, everything associated with the Apalachicola River.	17	А.	And all in going through this, I will have to I don't recall it; and but I know I went
18	0	Okay. Now, in the attachment to the e-mail that	18		with her on many of these surveys. And I know I
10		was originally from Ms. Light and then you	10		did one with her on Swift Slough, which took
20		forwarded it on, there's a letter from Marian	20		quite a bit of time.
21		Berndt, B E R N D T, to Jerry Ziewitz. Do you	21	0	Now, I want to
22		see that?	22		And if I may, sir?
23	Δ.	Okay. Yes.	23	-	Yes. Go ahead.
24		And it's dated July 13, 2006?	24		In reading the letter, it does indicate that,
25		Yes.	25		yes, I was there.
_		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		182			184
1	Q.	Okay. And the letter says, dear Mr. Ziewitz. In	1	Q.	Now, it says in the last sentence of the first
2		response to a request from you and Ted Hoehn,	2		paragraph that this survey was needed to estimate
3		Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation	3		water depths in Swift Slough for various
4		Commission, Helen and Helen Light of our staff	4		discharges higher than the disconnection flow.
5		surveyed the controlling sill elevation of Swift	5		Right?
6		Slough.	6	Α.	Correct.
7		Do you see that?	7	Q.	And the first paragraph had referred to a survey
8	Α.	Correct.	8		of the controlling sill elevation of Swift
9	Q.	And it says that that survey was conducted on	9		Slough. Right?
10		July 6, 2006. Right?	10	Α.	Correct.
11	Α.	Uh-huh.	11	Q.	And just in plain English, the controlling sill
12	Q.		12		is the height that the water from the river needs
13	-	Correct.	13		to get over in order to inundate that slough.
14	Q.	That's three days after the picture you took and	14		Right?
15		submitted in your testimony in this court.	15	-	Simplistically, yes.
16		Right?	16	Q.	I'll take it.
17	-	That's correct.	17		Thank you, Mr. Hoehn.
18 19	પ.	And it's true, Mr. Hoehn, that you did request the study that's referenced in this letter.	18 19		The so the survey was done to find out what river flow was needed to determine when
20		Right?	20		Swift Slough would become disconnected from the
20 21	Δ	I would have to have to assume that that is	20 21		river. Right?
21	Π.	the case since it references a request from me.	21	Δ	That's correct.
22		I don't remember doing it.	22		Now, on the last on the next to last page of
23	Q.	But you don't dispute the statement from the	23	ч.	this document and before we do that, let's
25	- -	acting office chief at the USGS that you	25		go there's a report attached to the Helen
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
			I		

			51, 2		107
		185			187
1		Light letter. Correct?	1		of water going over the sill and going
2		Attachment A, do you see that?	2		downstream. It doesn't mean that the entire
3		Yes.	3		width of the slough has got water flowing in it.
4	Q.	And attachment A is called Apalachicola River	4		All it means is that some water it may be half
5		Discharges Needed to Maintain Flowing Conditions	5		an inch; it may be a quarter of an inch, but some
6		in Swift Slough. Do you see that?	6		water is moving over that sill.
7	Α.	Correct.	7	Q.	Okay. And so at step 7, Ms. Light reports in
8	Q.	And it's conducted by Helen Light, as indicated	8		this survey that the estimated disconnection flow
9		on that page. Correct?	9		for Swift Slough, based on discharge at the
10	Α.	That is correct.	10		Chattahoochee Gage, is 4500 cubic feet per
11	Q.	Okay. And that's the one that you were there	11		second. Correct?
12		for?	12	Α.	Correct.
13	Α.	Correct.	13	Q.	And in July of 2006, six years later, the
14	Q.	Okay. So let's go to the table on the next to	14		disconnection flow has increased to 5600.
15	-	last page that Ms. Light created. And we'll put	15		Correct?
16		it on the screen so everyone can see that.	16	Δ.	Correct.
17		Do you see table 1?	17		That's an increase in the amount of water needed
18	Δ	Yes.	18	α.	to connect Swift Slough of 1100 cfs. Right?
19		And it's called Disconnection Flows for Swift	19	^	That's accurate math.
	α.		-		
20	•	Slough?	20	ц.	And it's also accurate math to say that the
21	_	That is correct.	21		amount of water needed to inundate that slough
22	Q.	And they were measured at three points in time.	22		where you took all those pictures of the dead
23		Correct?	23		mussels had increased by 25 percent over six
24		Correct. 1993, 2000, and 2006.	24	_	years. Correct?
25	Q.	Right. And then in the fine print underneath, it	25	Α.	Over six years; that's correct.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		186			188
1		186 says who took those measurements. Right?	1	Q.	188 Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra
1 2	А.		1 2	Q.	
		says who took those measurements. Right?		Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra
2		says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely.	2		Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006.
2 3	Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone	2 3	А.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that?
2 3 4	Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct?	2 3 4	А.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change.
2 3 4 5	Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct.	2 3 4 5	А.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by	2 3 4 5 6	А.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	А.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct? No. And this is a fine point that I need to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct? No. And this is a fine point that I need to make very clear on the definition of connection and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct? And we have actually worked with him on other restoration projects throughout the ACF system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct? No. And this is a fine point that I need to make very clear on the definition of connection and disconnection. And this is one that we have had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct? And we have actually worked with him on other restoration projects throughout the ACF system or not ACF, but through the Apalachicola
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct? No. And this is a fine point that I need to make very clear on the definition of connection and disconnection. And this is one that we have had significant discussion about with Ms. Light. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct? And we have actually worked with him on other restoration projects throughout the ACF system or not ACF, but through the Apalachicola system.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct? No. And this is a fine point that I need to make very clear on the definition of connection and disconnection. And this is one that we have had significant discussion about with Ms. Light. And that is connection can mean literally a trickle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct? And we have actually worked with him on other restoration projects throughout the ACF system or not ACF, but through the Apalachicola system. So you didn't recognize that I was reading from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	says who took those measurements. Right? Absolutely. In '93 it was taken by Helen Light and someone named Graham Lewis. Correct? Correct. And then the 2000 measurement was made by Mr. Ziewitz. Correct? That's what it says. And the 2006 measurement was made by Helen Light, you, and Rick Long? That is correct. All right. Now, in October of 1993, the disconnection shown in step 7 was 5100. Correct? That's what it reads. Okay. Now, in August of 2000, the disconnection flow for Swift Slough was 4500 cfs. Right? That's what it says. So that means that on August 2, 2000, if there were 4700 cfs flowing through Apalachicola River, Swift Slough gets inundated. Correct? No. And this is a fine point that I need to make very clear on the definition of connection and disconnection. And this is one that we have had significant discussion about with Ms. Light. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Now, Mr. Hoehn, you know why it took 1100 extra cfs of water to connect Swift Slough as of 2006. Right? You know that? All I know is things change. Things change. Mr. Hoehn, you would agree that certain reaches of the river were impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations for navigation. True? Previously that is correct. And one such location is Swift Slough. Correct? Previously that is correct. And you have read Dr. Kondolf's direct testimony in this case. Right? No. You haven't? No. Do you know who Dr. Kondolf is. Right? Absolutely. He's an expert hired for Florida. Correct? And we have actually worked with him on other restoration projects throughout the ACF system or not ACF, but through the Apalachicola system.

		189			191
1		his testimony when I said that Swift Slough was a	1		back to where that controlling sill is.
2		location that was impacted by channel erosion and	2	Q.	Mr. Hoehn, do you agree or disagree with sworn
3		lower water levels as a result of the historical	3		testimony from Dr. Kondolf that the sand
4		channel alterations?	4		deposited in Swift Slough increased the flow
5	Α.	No.	5		needed to connect it to the main river?
6	Q.	Now, were you aware that Dr. Kondolf submitted	6	Α.	I'm not the expert on that.
7		testimony that said Swift Slough is located in an	7	Q.	You know that over six years the amount of water
8		area of the river that experienced significant	8		increased by 25 percent. Right?
9		historical dredging. Did you know that Florida	9	Α.	But I can also look at the 1993, and it was not
10		submitted testimony on that here?	10		as much as that. So you have got a range between
11	Α.	No, I'm not. But I believe I have already	11		4500 and 5100 to 5600 cfs at which flows are
12		testified that that is precisely above that	12		were needed.
13		area is where there was significant dredging.	13	Q.	Is
14	Q.	Okay. So then you agree that Swift Slough has	14	Α.	And I have no idea what it requires now.
15		experienced significant historical dredging.	15		Mr. Hoehn, I'm talking about why the why the
16		Correct?	16		flow changed from 2000 to 2006. And you would
17	Α.	The area around Swift Slough, the main channel.	17		agree with Dr. Kondolf it's because there was
18		That's right. Thank you for clarifying.	18		sand deposited there from dredging; wouldn't you?
19	-	The main channel.	19	Α.	Dr. Kondolf is the expert, not me.
20	Q.		20		So, Mr. Hoehn, I want to stick with Swift Slough;
21		has had significant historical dredging. Right?	21	-	but I want to show you another declaration that
22	Α.	Yes.	22		you signed. Okay?
23	_	And sand put into circulation by the disturbance	23		Can you turn to tab 8 of your binder. And
24		caused by dredging was deposited at Swift Slough.	24		can you confirm that this is a declaration that
25		Right?	25		you signed on November 1, 2007?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		190			192
1	Α.	190 Some sand has come into Swift Slough.	1	Α.	192 Yes.
1 2	A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough.	1 2		
	_	Some sand has come into Swift Slough.	-		Yes.
2	_	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn	2		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12?
2 3	Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that.	2 3		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.)
2 3 4	Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right?	2 3 4		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry
2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is.	2 3 4 5		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption.
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well	2 3 4 5 6		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in	2 3 4 5 6 7		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling sill is. Depending upon where that controlling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If there is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling sill is. Depending upon where that controlling sill is and where the sand comes, it may or may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If there is a problem, you can ask me; and I will rule.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling sill is. Depending upon where that controlling sill is and where the sand comes, it may or may not impact how much water is needed to make it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If there is a problem, you can ask me; and I will rule. But I would appreciate it if you could agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling sill is. Depending upon where that controlling sill is and where the sand comes, it may or may not impact how much water is needed to make it past that controlling sill. It may start in just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If there is a problem, you can ask me; and I will rule. But I would appreciate it if you could agree. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling sill is. Depending upon where that controlling sill is and where the sand comes, it may or may not impact how much water is needed to make it past that controlling sill. It may start in just the mouth of the slough; but it may not make it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If there is a problem, you can ask me; and I will rule. But I would appreciate it if you could agree. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. (Time Noted: 3:10 p.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Some sand has come into Swift Slough. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right? I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is. Well All I can tell you is I have seen some sand in Swift Slough. You have? Yes. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right? In places. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right? If the controlling sill and, again, this was one of those questions that on your graph that was on well, it's the it doesn't have a page number; but it is the graph on the attachment where it shows where the controlling sill is. Depending upon where that controlling sill is and where the sand comes, it may or may not impact how much water is needed to make it past that controlling sill. It may start in just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		Yes. And that's your signature on page 12? (Whereupon the video was played.) MR. PRIMIS: Sorry. We have a sorry for the disruption. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break. MR. PRIMIS: Sure, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes. MR. PRIMIS: What rules would the Court like witnesses to follow while they're on the stand? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's up to counsel. I don't care whether you want them not to talk to their counsel or not. So it's up to you. MR. PRIMIS: Okay. We'll discuss it off the record. I just wanted to ask because this is the first witness. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If there is a problem, you can ask me; and I will rule. But I would appreciate it if you could agree. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.

		193			195
1		(Recess Called)	1		marker 35 to 50 reach, channel instability
2		(Time Noted: 3:21 p.m.)	2		related to water diversion into the Chipola
3		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Were counsel	3		cutoff and recovery from maintenance dredging may
4		able to agree on the question you asked	4		be affecting mussel habitat and contributing to
5		before recess?	5		stranding. Do you see that?
6		MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we I think	6	Α.	Correct.
7		we're going to table it until the end of this	7	Q.	And that was published just a couple weeks ago.
8		session. It didn't come up as an issue, but	8		Correct?
9		I just wanted to check with my colleagues	9	Α.	Correct.
10		first. We haven't had a chance to talk about	10	Q.	And then it says that that's happening especially
11		it.	11		in Swift Slough. Right?
12		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You let me	12	Α.	That's what it says.
13		know.	13	Q.	And it notes that Swift Slough occurs in an area
14		MR. PRIMIS: We will. Absolutely.	14		that required regular maintenance. Right?
15	BY	MR. PRIMIS:	15	Δ	Correct.
16	_	Mr. Hoehn, I had given you a declaration that you	16		And so you would agree that the U.S. Fish and
17	α.	had signed; but before we turn to that document	17	α.	Wildlife Service, like Dr. Kondolf, is saying
18		I want to just talk for a minute more about	18		that there's still effects of dredging on Swift
19		the the depositing of sand at Swift Slough.	19		Slough. Correct?
20		Could you turn in your book to the 2016	20	А.	I can't answer to Dr. Kondolf because I haven't
21		biological opinion. It's tab 2.	21		read his testimony on this. This is what the
22		Okay.	22	-	Fish and Wildlife Service's opinion was.
23	Q.	JX-168. And I'm going to refer you to page 130	23	Q.	And are you aware that the Fish and Wildlife
24		at the bottom of the page.	24		Service also said that the inlet at Swift Slough
25		MR. PRIMIS: I have got it up on the	25		continues to aggrade?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		194			196
1		screen, too, if it's helpful for anyone.	1		At the top of page 133, that's where it says
2	Λ		-		
		Okay.	2		that.
3		Okay. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom	2 3		that. I'm sorry. Second line of page 133.
3 4		-		А.	
		Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom	3		I'm sorry. Second line of page 133.
4	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this	3 4		I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says.
4 5	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion?	3 4 5		I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean
4 5 6	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I	3 4 5 6	Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or
4 5 6 7	Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what	3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed?
4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about.	3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition.
4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? Till accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? Till agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? Till accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? Till agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? Till accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? Till agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation miles don't always necessarily mean the same	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen. I'm sorry. I misspoke, Mr. Hoehn; and you seized
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation miles don't always necessarily mean the same thing. So that's why I'm trying to verify it.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen. I'm sorry. I misspoke, Mr. Hoehn; and you seized right on it.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation miles don't always necessarily mean the same thing. So that's why I'm trying to verify it. And it's close enough.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? Til accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? Til agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen. I'm sorry. I misspoke, Mr. Hoehn; and you seized right on it. It says the inlet at Swift Slough continues
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation miles don't always necessarily mean the same thing. So that's why I'm trying to verify it. And it's close enough. Okay. Thank you. So would you agree that the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen. I'm sorry. I misspoke, Mr. Hoehn; and you seized right on it. It says the inlet at Swift Slough continues to aggrade. Correct?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation miles don't always necessarily mean the same thing. So that's why I'm trying to verify it. And it's close enough. Okay. Thank you. So would you agree that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service said that in river	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen. I'm sorry. I misspoke, Mr. Hoehn; and you seized right on it. It says the inlet at Swift Slough continues to aggrade. Correct? That's what it says.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, three lines up from the bottom of 130 and to confirm, you did read this document, right, the biological opinion? Yes, I did. But I'll need to it's so large I still need to kind of orient myself as to what sections you're talking about. That's fine. This was the one that was published a couple weeks ago. Right? Correct. Now, three lines up from the bottom it says, in the RM 35-50 reach. Do you see that? Correct. And that's talking about the river mile 35 to 50 reach. Correct? Correct. And so that means 35 to 50 miles north of the Apalachicola Bay. Correct? I'm trying to think. River miles and navigation miles don't always necessarily mean the same thing. So that's why I'm trying to verify it. And it's close enough. Okay. Thank you. So would you agree that the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	I'm sorry. Second line of page 133. That's what it says. And the term aggrade, you understand that to mean to raise the grade or level of a river or streambed? I'll accept that as an appropriate definition. And concluding by depositing detritus or sediment. Right? That's how it aggrades. Correct? I'll agree with that. So the Fish and Wildlife Service reported just last month that Swift Slough continues, as of now, to have sediment deposited that causes the riverbed to raise to rise there. Correct? Is that what they're saying? The riverbed has I'm sorry. absolutely risen. I'm sorry. I misspoke, Mr. Hoehn; and you seized right on it. It says the inlet at Swift Slough continues to aggrade. Correct?

			51, 20	5 10 (V	
	~	197			199
1	Q.	And that's because of impacts of dredging,	1		your job includes coordinating with the U.S. Fish
2		correct, according to Fish and Wildlife at least?	2		and Wildlife Service and other Commission staff
3		True?	3		to protect and recover species listed under the
4	Α.	All I can say is that that's what they have	4		Endangered Species Act. Correct?
5		indicated is, you know, yes, it was an area of	5		Correct.
6		significant dredging. So that's what they said.	6	Q.	And these species you say include two freshwater
7	Q.	In 2016. True?	7		mussels, the fat threeridge and the purple
8	Α.	That's correct.	8		bankclimber?
9	Q.	Okay. Now, let's go back to your declaration,	9	Α.	Correct.
10		Mr. Hoehn. Can you turn	10	Q.	And then in paragraph 11 and this is, again,
11		MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, do you	11		in tab 8 you state in the second sentence,
12		have that? It's tab 8.	12		other than Fish and Wildlife's activities, you
13		Tab 8.	13		are perhaps most familiar with U.S. Army Corps of
14	BY I	MR. PRIMIS:	14		Engineers' activities. Correct?
15	Q.	I want to turn, if you would, Mr. Hoehn, to	15	Α.	That is correct.
16		paragraph 10. Actually, before I do, just to set	16	Q.	And you understood that to be a true statement
17		the stage, this declaration on the front page has	17		when you swore to it. Correct?
18		a caption called In Re: Tri-State Water Rights	18	Α.	Yes.
19		Litigation. Do you see that on the first page of	19	Q.	Okay. Then you say the Corps' operations impact
20		your declaration?	20		dramatically the well-being of the Apalachicola
21	Α.	Oh, I'm sorry. You're wait a minute. Is	21		River ecosystem because the Corps operates the
22		this all right. You're on a different one.	22		dams and reservoirs, e.g., Lake Lanier and Buford
23		So what tab am I on?	23		Dam, that release water into the Apalachicola
24		Tab 8.	24		River.
25	Α.	Tab 8.	25		And you included that in your sworn
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
	_	198			200
1		Okay.	1		testimony. Correct?
2	А.	And this one is and, again, forgive me on this	2		Yes, sir.
3		because I have a different way of trying to	3	Q.	Now, in paragraph 16 on page 5 of your
4		remember which one of these cases were ones that	4		declaration I'll give you a minute to get
5		were filed. This is the Middle District Court of	5	^	there.
6 7	0	Florida. Correct? Correct.	7		Okay. You reference an entity called EnviroScience.
8		Which was in the the way I remember it, it was	8	α.	Correct?
9	А.	more dealing with the listed species.	9	Δ	Correct.
10	Q.	This one certainly does.	10		And that's a consulting firm that you worked with
11		Okay.	11	ч.	in evaluating the mussel die-off in Swift Slough.
12	Q.	•	12		Correct?
13		case that you had previously signed a declaration	13	Α.	They actually reviewed and did surveys all up and
14		in, that that was combined in a multi-district	14		down the river in 2005. They did surveys all up
15		litigation into this tri-states case. Do you	15		and down the river, and Swift Slough was one that
16		know that?	16		were done. And they also established some
17	Α.		17		long-term, what we call tagging sites on the
18		again, this is why I'm asking these questions is	18		mainstem.
19		there were so many cases put out there	19	Q.	And just to make sure we have a clear question
20		individually that were then combined. So I have	20		and answer, EnviroScience, among its other
21		to try and compartmentalize them.	21		responsibilities, conducted a survey of Swift
22	Q.	Okay. So this is your November 1, 2007,	22		Slough in 2005. Correct?
23		declaration. And I would like to turn your	23	Α.	As far as I recollect, yes.
24		attention to paragraph 10. And in paragraph 10,	24	Q.	And in paragraph 16, the last sentence, you
1		you stated in this sworn declaration that part of	25		participated directly in reviewing
25					
25		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
25		THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart	200		THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

		TRIAL - Octobe	er 31, 20	J16 (V	· · · · · ·
		201		~	203
1	_	EnviroScience's work. Right?	1	Q.	And you also said in this sworn declaration that
2	Α.	What I my review of their work was reviewing	2		that sand buried pools known to contain large
3		the outcome of it and what they had to say. I	3		numbers of fat threeridge with several inches to
4		did not participate in the diving. I'm not	4		several feet of sand.
5		even though I am a certified diver, I'm not	5	Α.	That is correct.
6		allowed to dive for the State of Florida.	6	Q.	Now, you understand, Mr. Hoehn, that after you
7	Q.	You directly reviewed their work, sir. Correct?	7		filed this declaration in 2007, the litigation
8	Α.	That is correct.	8		between Florida and the Army Corps in federal
9	Q.	And as of this point in time at the end of 2007,	9		court continued. Right?
10		you had continued to work closely with	10	Α.	I'm aware that there was, you know, the combined
11		EnviroScience since 2005 to document mussel	11		effort, yes.
12		status in Apalachicola River. Correct?	12	Q.	And you know that in 2009 the State of Florida
13	Α.	That is correct.	13		moved for summary judgment on its endangered
14		So let's go to paragraph 17. And that's where	14		species claims against the Corps. Correct?
15	~ .	you stated in a sworn declaration in the second	15	Δ	I recollect that that happened.
16		•	16	-	
		sentence that during the summer of 2006,		ખ.	And it was in the same federal court in which you
17		EnviroScience conducted mussel monitoring at the	17		had signed this declaration, Middle District of
18		Apalachicola River mainstem at river mile 44.3	18		Florida; right?
19		and Swift Slough. Correct?	19	А.	I don't know if it was the Middle District of
20	Α.		20	_	Florida, but I remember a court did.
21	Q.	And you report there that nearly all, greater	21	Q.	Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, in tabs 9, 10, and 11 of
22		than 90 percent I'm sorry. This is in the	22		your binder, I have three submissions from the
23		next sentence nearly all, nearly more than	23		summary judgment briefing on the Endangered
24		90 percent of the endangered mussels at these	24		Species Act claim. Okay?
25		locations died that summer. Right?	25		I just want to identify them with you first.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		202			204
1	Α.	That is correct.	1		In tab 9 we have the State of Florida and City of
2	Q.	Following one month of flows measuring about	2		Apalachicola's Joint Motion and Memorandum in
3		5,000 cfs at the Chattahoochee Gage?	3		Support of Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on
4	Α.	Correct.	4		Phase 2 Claims. Do you see that?
5		Okay. Let's flip now to page 8, paragraph 23.	5	Α.	Yes.
6		Now, in paragraph 23, you point out that you	6	Q.	Okay. And that was filed, if you look at the
7		went back to Swift Slough in 2007 with the	7		top, on December 9, 2009.
8		EnviroScience team. Correct?	8	Δ	Okay.
9	Α.		9		Okay. The next page next tab, tab 10, is a
	-	And you resurveyed the sites there?	10	હ્ય.	factual appendix in support of that motion. Do
10	Q.				
11	A.		11		you see that?
12		And that included Swift Slough. Right?	12		Yes, I do.
13	_	That is correct.	13	_	Also filed on December 9?
14	Q.	And when you went back there, you found that	14		Yes.
15		almost all mussel habitats within Swift Slough	15	Q.	And you know you received a copy of that factual
16		were dewatered.	16		appendix back around the time it was filed.
17		That's in the middle of the paragraph.	17		Right?
18		Correct?	18	Α.	I no, I don't know.
19	Α.	Correct.	19	Q.	You don't recall?
20	Q.	And you said in this sworn declaration that it	20	Α.	I don't recall.
21		was apparent that large volumes of sand had	21	Q.	Okay. And then tab 11 is a declaration from
22		entered the slough at the inflow and buried a	22		Mr. Barr that was attached to that factual
23		large expanse of the upper reach of Swift Slough.	23		appendix. Do you see that?
		Right?	24	Α.	Okay.
24		Right:	1		
	Α.	That is correct.	25	Q.	And on top it also says that it was filed on
24	Α.	That is correct.	25	Q.	And on top it also says that it was filed on THE REPORTING GROUP
24	Α.	-	25	Q.	And on top it also says that it was filed on THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

		205			207
1		12/9/09. Do you see that?	1	Α.	That's what it states.
2	Α.	Correct.	2	Q.	And they could have done that, he said, without
3	Q.	Okay. I want to walk through these documents	3		excessive lowering of Lake Lanier for storage for
4		with you, Mr. Hoehn.	4		water supply. Right?
5	Α.	Okay.	5	Α.	That's what the document says.
6	Q.	Now, let's start with the factual appendix, tab	6	Q.	And that back in 2006, you yourself were
7		11 tab 10. I'm sorry.	7		monitoring lake levels at Lake Lanier. Correct?
8		Let's start with tab 11 sorry about	8	Α.	I monitor the lake levels all the way up and down
9		that Mr. Barr's declaration that was	9		the system.
10		attached. Okay?	10	Q.	And, in fact, you submitted another declaration
11	Α.	It's the one that starts Exhibit 3?	11		in federal court where you provided the federal
12	Q.	Yes.	12		district court with information on lake levels
13	Α.	Okay.	13		and releases from the dams in connection with
14	Q.	And you know Mr. Barr. Right?	14		Florida's claims concerning endangered species.
15	Α.	I am familiar with Mr. Barr, yes.	15		Didn't you do that?
16	Q.	At the time of this declaration in 2009, he was	16	Α.	If it would you like to point me to which
17		executive director of the Northwest Florida Water	17		particular one so that I can
18		Management District. Correct?	18	Q.	Certainly.
19	Α.	Correct.	19	Α.	answer correctly?
20	Q.	And you know he was knowledgeable about the	20		MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, may I approach?
21		hydrology of the ACF River Basin. Correct?	21		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sure.
22	Α.	Correct. He participated all through the.	22		MR. PRIMIS: We have another
23		Comprehensive Study and the Compact.	23		declaration.
24	Q.	And let's take a look at Mr. Barr's declaration.	24	Α.	The answer to your question is yes.
25		And specifically I want to go to paragraph 42	25	Q.	Okay. And just to identify it for the record,
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		206			208
1		on page 17. And, Mr. Hoehn, you will agree that	1		Mr. Hoehn, I handed you a supplemental
2		Mr. Barr said in his sworn statement submitted in	2		declaration that you filed in the federal
3		federal court that the sensitivity of the Corps'	3		district court in Alabama. Correct?
4		reduction of flows in the Apalachicola River to	4	_	That is correct.
5		5,000 cfs cap during low water events and	5		And it's document 437 on that docket?
6		particularly extended droughts can be exhibited	6	-	Correct.
7		by specific instances. Right?	7	Q.	And in this submission, this sworn statement,
8	A.	-	8		you're providing lake levels and dam releases in
9	Q.	And he refers to a 5,000 cfs cap during low water	9		connection with a claim concerning Army Corps
10	•	events. Right?	10		operations and its impact on endangered species.
11		Correct. And further down that paragraph, another skip	11 12	٨	Correct?
12	۵.			А.	This is regarding the operations and the effects of the low flows on the species, yes.
13 14		one sentence; and then he says, at flows of 5400 cfs Swift Slough is barely connected to the	13 14	0	And that's Army Corps operations. Right?
14		mainstem of the river at the inflow and	14		When I say Corps, yes, I am referring to the U.S.
16		disconnected downstream. Right?	16	Π.	Army Corps of Engineers.
17	Α.	-	17	0	And going back to Mr. Barr's declaration now,
18	-	And you knew that was true based on the study	18	-u.	the one at tab 11 and we're back at that
19	ч с .	that you had done with Helen Light a year	19		paragraph 42. And he goes on in that same
20		earlier. Correct?	20		sentence, he goes, which 6300 cfs would have
21	Α.	This isn't mine, so I have to assume he used that	21		fully watered Swift Slough. Do you see that?
22		information. But this is not my declaration.	22	Α.	Correct.
23	Q.	Okay. In the next in the next sentence,	23	-	And then he says, as noted, the Corps refused to
24		Mr. Barr states that the Corps could have	24		agree to that flow. Correct?
25		released 6300 cfs. Correct?	25	Α.	That's what the declarations says.
			1		THE REPORTING GROUP
1		THE REPORTING GROUP			
		THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart

Florida v. Georgia

			51, 20	10 (1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	~	209			211 422
1	Q.	Now, you know, based on your work with Ms. Hoehn,	1		endangering these species. And in paragraph 430
2		that 6300 cfs would have watered Swift Slough.	2		it says, in the summer of 2006 the USGS concluded
3		Correct?	3		Swift Slough required not less than 5700 cfs flow
4	Α.	Did you mean Ms. Light?	4		at the Chattahoochee Gage to remain shallowly
5	Q.	Sorry. You know, based on your work with	5		connected.
6		Ms. Light, that 6300 cfs would have watered Swift	6		Do you see that?
7		Slough. Right?	7	Α.	Correct.
8	Α.	At that I can tell you right now that 6300	8	Q.	And not less than 6200 to maintain a connection
9		will keep Swift Slough inundated.	9		depth of a half a foot. Right?
10	Q.	And in 2006 when you did the work, 5600 would	10	Α.	Correct.
11		have watered the slough. Right?	11	Q.	And as support for that, the State of Florida
12	Α.	It would have connected it. It would not have	12	-•	here in this court filing cites that letter to
13	2.1	necessarily provided all the water it needed.	13		Jerry Ziewitz, the one that you were copied on.
14	0	That's a fair clarification.	14		Correct?
	α.			^	Correct.
15		Now, Mr. Barr is telling this federal court	15	-	
16		for Florida in a sworn statement that if the Army	16	Q.	And the one that included the Helen Light survey
17		Corps would release more water, that it could	17		that you went on. Right?
18	_	fully water Swift Slough. Right?	18		Correct.
19	Α.	That is what the declaration says.	19	Q.	So there is no no dispute in this court filing
20	Q.	And Mr. Barr's declaration is also telling the	20		Florida is talking about the work that you and
21		federal court that the Army Corps had the power	21		Helen Light did. Right?
22		and the ability to do just that. Correct?	22	Α.	This is whoever filed this let's see. Yes,
23	Α.	In 2006, that is correct.	23		I the title is State of Florida and the City
24	Q.	He goes on to say that because the Army Corps	24		of Apalachicola.
25		would not release that additional water, in the	25	Q.	Right. What we're the letter at 430 is the
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		210			212
1		next to last sentence, over 30,000 fat threeridge	1		letter that you were copied on; and that reflects
2		mussels died. Do you see that?	2		the work that you and Helen Light did. True?
3	Α.	Yes.	3	Α.	Yes.
4	Q.	And he said in the prior sentence that the Corps	4	Q.	Okay. Let's now go to paragraph 433, okay.
5		is obligated to protect them. Right?	5		Paragraph 433, the State of Florida and the City
6	Α.	That is correct.	6		of Apalachicola in this submission is referring
7	Q.	Okay. Mr. Hoehn, now I want to go to tab 10,	7		to the EnviroScience work. Correct?
8		which is the factual appendix to the summary	8	Α.	Correct.
9		judgment motion, document 310 in the Middle	9	Q.	And in this first sentence they say that
10		District of Florida document. Are you there?	10		EnviroScience estimated that several thousand
11	Α.	Yes, sir.	11		mussels, nearly 31 percent, of fat threeridge in
12	Q.	Now, this is a very lengthy document; but I want	12		Swift Slough died during low flows experienced in
13		to refer you well, first, before I do, this	13		the summer of 2006. Right?
14		was filed December 9, 2009. Do you see that?	14	Α.	Correct.
15	Α.	Correct.	15	-	And you were this is the same EnviroScience
16		Okay. I want to refer you to paragraph 430 on	16	-•	entity that you were supervising. Right?
17		page 158.	17	Α.	I was not supervising them.
18	Α.	430 on 158, is that what you said?	18		It was work you directly reviewed. Correct?
19	-	Yes.	19		I reviewed their work, but I was not their
20	-	I'm sorry. 430 is on 154.	20	,	supervisor.
21	Δ	Okay.	21	Ŋ	Just I just want to make clear this is the
22		Are you there?	22	-	same EnviroScience that you're familiar with and
		Yes.	22		whose work you reviewed. True?
23	Δ		~3		misse work you reviewed. True:
23 24	_		24	Δ	Correct
24	_	Okay. So now, this is being filed in support of	24 25		Correct.
	_	Okay. So now, this is being filed in support of Florida's claim that the Army Corps was	24 25		Now, let's look at the brief that this was
24	_	Okay. So now, this is being filed in support of			

1				10 (1	
		213		0	215
1		attached to. That's in tab 9.	1	ч.	And do you see how it cites to the FA-2, factual
2		MR. PRIMIS: And for the record, I will	2	-	appendix 2?
3		just note that tab 9 is document 309 in the	3		Yes, I do.
4		Northern District I'm sorry, in the Middle	4	Q.	And it states paragraphs 428 to 440. Right?
5		District of Florida case, case No. 307-MD-1.	5	Α.	Whatever that is.
6	BY	MR. PRIMIS:	6	Q.	Well, we were just reading through together
7	Q.	And do you see that this is a Memorandum in	7		paragraphs 433, 432. You recall that; right?
8		Support of a Joint Motion For Summary Judgment on	8	Α.	If
9		Phase 2 Claims?	9	Q.	You can refresh yourself if you want.
10	Α.	Yes, I do.	10	Α.	Okay. If that's if that's what that is, okay.
11	Q.	And you understand that the Phase 2 claims	11	Q.	Okay.
12		related to endangered species. Correct?	12	Α.	I will accept that.
13	Α.	If okay. I'm just trying to read the	13	_	Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to turn to the next page.
14		part here just to verify it because Phase 1,	14		And up at the top, it there is a reference to
15		Phase 2 not being a lawyer, it gets me kind	15		the Service. We are talking there about the
16		of confused as to which one was which.	16		federal agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
17	0	If I told you Phase 1 was water supply and	17		Service. You understand that; right?
	હ.			۸	Yes, I do.
18		Phase 2 was species, would you take my word for	18		-
19	٨	it?	19 20	પ.	Okay. In this sentence the State of Florida says
20		I'll accept that.	20		that the Service allowed this to happen, that
21	Q.	Okay. I just wanted to cut through that.	21		Swift Slough incident, by abandoning its official
22		Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that	22		strategy for protecting and restoring the
23		one of the grounds on which Florida based its	23	_	mussels. Do you see that?
24		Endangered Species Act claims against the Corps	24		Correct.
25		was the 2006 mussel die-off in Swift Slough.	25	Q.	And you know Florida took that position in this
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		214			216
1		Right?	1		litigation against the Corps. Right?
2	Α.	That that was was part of it. Correct.	2		Do you have any reason to dispute what it
3	Q.	Okay. And can you go to page 47 of this brief.	3		says in that sentence?
4		In the bottom paragraph, do you see where it says	4	Α.	No, I do not have any reason to dispute that.
5		that the Service found Fish and Wildlife	5	Q.	Okay. Now, I want to turn to the last paragraph.
6		Service had found that, quote, locations	6		MR. PRIMIS: And I'm going to ask
7		previously containing the highest mussel density	7		Mr. Smith to blow this up on the screen.
8		were the ones most affected by mortality in 2006			The siniti to blow this up on the serven.
9		were the ones most uncered by mortality in 2000	8	BY	MR. PRIMIS:
1		and 2007 during Corps operations under prior	8 9		•
10					MR. PRIMIS:
10 11		and 2007 during Corps operations under prior	9		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48,
	А.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see	9 10		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District
11		and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct.	9 10 11		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following:
11 12 13		and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating	9 10 11 12 13		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced
11 12 13 14	Q.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan?	9 10 11 12 13 14		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for
11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed
11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence the State of Florida represents to the federal	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence the State of Florida represents to the federal Court in that case that among the mussel species	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough in 2006 and 2007. True?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence the State of Florida represents to the federal Court in that case that among the mussel species impacted was the entire population of Swift	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough in 2006 and 2007. True? That's that is correct.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence the State of Florida represents to the federal Court in that case that among the mussel species	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough in 2006 and 2007. True? That's that is correct. Now, I want to put back up that picture that you
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence the State of Florida represents to the federal Court in that case that among the mussel species impacted was the entire population of Swift Slough. Did I read that correctly?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough in 2006 and 2007. True? That's that is correct.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	and 2007 during Corps operations under prior Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see that? That's correct. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating Plan? Correct. That's the Army Corps' at the time their operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. Right? That was correct. Okay. The next sentence in the next sentence the State of Florida represents to the federal Court in that case that among the mussel species impacted was the entire population of Swift Slough. Did I read that correctly?	 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	Q. A. Q.	MR. PRIMIS: And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this submission to the United States Federal District Court, the State of Florida said the following: With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. Do you see that? Yes, I do. And you would agree with me that the State of Florida told the federal court that the Army Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough in 2006 and 2007. True? That's that is correct. Now, I want to put back up that picture that you

			- ,	U 16 (V	
1		217 picture with all the dead mussels.	1		219 it, that tonnage, went to either Bainbridge, some
2		MR. PRIMIS: Can we do that, Mr. Smith?	2		of the mills, I believe, at Fort Gaines, and over
2	RV N	MR. PRIMIS: Can we do that, Mr. Smith?	2		in Columbus.
4		Remember this one?	4		Fort Gaines is in Georgia.
5	α.	We looked at it at the beginning. You said	4 5	0	I was just going to ask you if you could clarify
6		you wanted the Court to know something bad	6	હ.	for those of us that are not as familiar with the
7		happened at Swift Slough. Right?	7		geography, those last areas that you just
8	۸	Absolutely.	8		mentioned are all areas in Georgia?
9	-	And this picture was taken on July 3, 2006.	9	Δ	Correct.
10	α.	Correct?	10		Okay. So if I understood you correctly, it was
11	Δ	Correct.	11	હ્ય.	primarily for the benefit of commerce in Georgia?
12		Can we put the brief on top of that. And I just	12	Δ.	Correct.
13	α.	want to confirm, Mr. Hoehn, when the State of	13	-	And when did this dredging take place?
14		Florida tells the federal court that the Corps	14		The very I don't have my document with me; so
15		killed essentially all of the mussels in Swift	15	Α.	I'll try and do this from memory. Some of the
16		Slough in 2006 and 2007, they're talking about	16		very first very limited dredging occurred in
17		the same mussels in the picture you have advanced	17		the 1800's when it was a not modern-day
18		in this court. Correct?	18		navigation channel. And, in fact, Blountstown
19	Α.	That is correct.	19		was where they had the very first dredging
20	Λ.	MR. PRIMIS: No further questions.	20		occurring. And it, again, was a very narrow and
21		MS. WINE: Your Honor, we have a blowup	21		very shallow channel.
22		of the map of the Apalachicola River that it	22		Dredging really and it occurred off and on
23		might be easier for Mr. Hoehn to refer to	23		up through the Civil War; and after the Civil War
24		during his testimony. Would it be okay if we	24		occurred dredging had to occur. And then the
25		set it up	25		modern navigation channel, again, started
20		THE REPORTING GROUP	20		THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		218			220
1		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sure.	1		actually in somewhere in the '50's, '60's,
2		MS. WINE: by the witness?	2		early '70's time frame with the State of
3		Okay. Thank you.	3		Florida's first permit right around 1979 until we
4		REDIRECT EXAMINATION	4		killed it in 2005.
5	BY N	4S. WINE:	5	Q.	And where did this dredging take place along the
6	Q.	Good afternoon, Mr. Hoehn. Thank you for being	6		river?
7		here today.	7		And I know it's hard for you since you don't
8	Α.	Good afternoon. Thank you.	8		have a pointer. If it's easier, if his Honor is
9	Q.	I want to pick up on some of the questions that	9		okay with it, to stand up and show.
10		Georgia's counsel was asking you about prior	10		THE WITNESS: May I stand up?
11		Corps activities. Okay?	11	Α.	Okay. As I indicated earlier, the main dredging
12		He asked you a number of questions about	12		occurred right around Blountstown. And right in
13		dredging. Do you recall that?	13		through here is a highway 20, U.S. highway 20.
14	Α.	Yes, I do.	14		Right in here was the first major problem reach.
15	Q.	Why did the Corps dredge the river?	15		Then you had various minor dredging down through
16	Α.	Dredging was authorized to provide navigation	16		the middle reach. But the next really major
17		from Columbus, Georgia, Bainbridge, all the way	17		reach was this bend right here. And then this
18		down to the Apalachicola primarily to serve	18		is site 53. And that's the one that I mentioned
19		commerce in Georgia.	19		earlier that had several football fields of sand
20	Q.	Did the dredging benefit Florida?	20		that are now gone down the river. And then right
21	Α.	Very little. About the only the biggest	21		in here is in the Chipola cutoff area that is
22		tonnage was actually in the upper or about a	22		labeled on the map, that is about where the Sand
23		total of 12 miles from the upper part of Lake	23		Mountain area that particular reach also
24		Seminole to basically right at the Chattahoochee	24		received, again, the vast majority of it.
25		Gage, which was sand and gravel. All the rest of	25		All through the upper reach, most of it did
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
1		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart

		221	., 20		
1		221 not require dredging because, as you can see,	1		223 river after the cessation of dredging to address
2		it's fairly straight, and doesn't it doesn't	2		any impacts that the dredging had on the river?
3		really need dredging until you start getting the	3	Δ	Yes, we have. You know, the first things that,
4		sinuosity, or bends, in the river.	4	Λ.	you know, we tried to deal with were in the upper
5	0	And so it's I know it's hard for everybody to	5		part of the river, although it isn't due to
6	α.	see; but the areas that you were pointing out	6		dredging, is we opened up and allowed some of the
7		where the dredging occurred, if I'm right in	7		cold water that some of these anadromous fish
8		terms of reaches, is that the middle reach and	8		need to make sure that they had cold water
9		the very upper portion of the lower reach?	9		available to them. We have also gone in one of
10	Δ	Right. This would be the middle, and then	10		the cutoffs and I'm trying to see if I can
11		usually down to right about here, which would be	11		kind of pick it out. It isn't very easy to pick
12		Corley Slough. Some occurred further south, but	12		out, but it's in the lower tidal reach. It's a
13		it was relatively minor.	13		cutoff that is commonly called Battle Bend
14	0	And on about how many miles of the river did the	14		where, because of low water and the lack of
15	ч.	dredging occur?	15		recreational use and fishery habitat at during
16	Δ.	It varied from year to year. But we could always	16		low water, we went in and did a multimillion
17	7.1	count on those three reaches which you know,	17		dollar effort to open up both the lower end of
18		the area at 53B, Wewahitchka, that's about a	18		this cutoff and with the help of some
19		mile. The area around Corley Slough is maybe	19		geomorphologists that did some studies for us,
20		about three-quarters of a mile to a mile. And	20		they designed work that needed to be done in the
21		the area of Blountstown, again, maybe about a	21		upper end to help ensure that we would have some
22		mile to three-quarters of a mile, if that.	22		sort of life expectancy for our work.
23	Q.	And so if I'm following your math, that's about	23	Q.	Do you know what the term dredge spoil disposal
24	_ .	2 to 3 miles roughly of the river?	24	-	means?
25	Α.	Correct. Where they had the vast majority every	25	Α.	Yes, I do.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		222			224
1		year.	1	Q.	And has Florida done any why don't you tell us
2	Q.	And what is the length of the entire Apalachicola	2		what that is. Sorry.
3		River?	3	Α.	Dredge spoil disposal is, as I indicated to the
4	Α.	106 miles. But when you count banks, you're	4		other gentleman, is when they were taking the
5		talking 212.	5		hydraulic dredge, where they were sucking up the
6	Q.	And you mentioned earlier that Florida killed the	6		sand with water. They would then put the pipe
7		dredging. Correct?	7		over onto a sandbar or and if I may clarify
8	Α.	That is correct. We the State of Florida	8		when I say sandbar, I'm talking about sand that
9		denied the dredging permit.	9		is on the inside bend or point of the river as
10	Q.	And when was that?	10		opposed to what one would normally have in the
11	Α.	2005.	11		ocean as a sandbar. So I'm if you will grant
12	Q.	And has any dredging occurred since 2005?	12		me that clarification.
13	Α.	Dredging actually hasn't occurred since early	13		They would put the sand up onto these
14		2000. They were unable to dredge due to low	14		designated and approved cites. And those cites
15		water conditions prior to 2005 to roughly 2001, I	15		would then receive the amount of X amount of
16		believe. And there hasn't been any dredging	16		material that were calculated that the cite could
17		since.	17		hold with the concept that, A, they would not go
18	Q.	So the permit was denied in 2005, but the	18		into the floodplain, but that the sand would be
19		dredging activity actually stopped around 2000?	19		removed and stay within the system during high
20	Α.	Correct.	20		flows so that at high flows the water would take
21	Q.	Okay. Roughly	21		the sand away and keep it within the within
22	Α.	Give or take a year.	22		the system.
23	Q.	Roughly 15 years ago?	23	Q.	And has what has happened to the dredge spoil
24	Δ	Correct.	24		disposal now, to bring ourselves current?
24	Λ.				
24 25	_	And has Florida done anything to restore the	25	Α.	As I indicated, you know, we have got many of
	_	And has Florida done anything to restore the THE REPORTING GROUP	25	Α.	As I indicated, you know, we have got many of THE REPORTING GROUP

TRIAL - October 31, 2016 (Vol. I)

Florida v. Georgia

			T Í	,	
					227
1		these areas, you know, over, you know, however	1		time of this presentation which is roughly
2		many years it is, 18, you can go out to areas	2	•	2005; is that correct?
-		like the cite around and just north of Swift			Correct. I believe that's when it is.
4		Slough, and what used to be a desert of sand has	4	Q.	that the information here was accurate at the
5		now gone back to the natural gently sloping bank	5		time, that the down-cutting of the channel was
6		habitat, and other areas that we have also seen	6	•	approximately 5 feet. Do you recall that?
7		this happen, you know, up and down the system.	7	_	That's correct.
8		So much of the sand material has been	8	Q.	And I think that you said that that has changed;
9		recaptured by the river, and the river is	9	•	is that correct?
10		actually now using that sand to reconfigure	10	_	That's correct.
11		itself in, you know, some it's trying to get	11		And in what way has that changed?
12		back to some sort of equilibrium. It's not there	12	А.	And, again, the down-cutting, we're seeing
13		yet.	13		changes in where the bed of the river is. You
14		And we're also seeing in areas such as	14		know, when I go down with some of our fisheries
15		Blountstown and Wewahitchka and other areas	15		people in the boats, you know, there are areas
16		where, in fact, you know, the bed of the river	16		where at low flow the bed of the river is high
17		has actually risen; and, you know, we're now	17		enough that even a jon boat has some issues
18		getting water back into the floodplain in areas	18		trying to get through it. And a jon boat has a
19	~	that we were concerned about previously.	19		very shallow draft.
20	Q.	, ,	20		And so we're seeing that, you know, while
21		you that Georgia's counsel gave you?	21		there has been down-cutting in the river in
22	_	Yes, I do.	22		the upper river, it's there. It's not going to
23		Could you turn to Georgia tab 1, which is GX-72.	23		change. But, you know, where it is down the rest
24		Yes.	24		of the river, it's changing because, you know,
25	Q.	And if you would please turn to page 3, slide 3,	25		we're no longer dredging. The sand in the river
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		226			228
1		which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do	1		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where
2		which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that?	2		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go.
2 3		which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4 ?	2 3	Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to
2 3 4	Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River.	2 3 4		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting?
2 3 4 5	Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes.	2 3 4 5		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	 which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked 	2 3 4 5 6		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	 which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? 	2 3 4 5 6 7		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A.	 which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	 which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	<pre>which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Α.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct? Correct. And the down-cutting that was necessary related	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А. Q. А.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable, becoming more natural to what they used to be.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct? Correct. And the down-cutting that was necessary related to the construction of that dam?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А. Q. А.	 are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable, becoming more natural to what they used to be. Okay. This is all due to the cessation of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct? Correct. And the down-cutting that was necessary related to the construction of that dam? I would say as a result of construction of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А. Q. А.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable, becoming more natural to what they used to be. Okay. This is all due to the cessation of the dredging and navigation activities?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct? Correct. And the down-cutting that was necessary related to the construction of that dam? I would say as a result of construction of the dam, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable, becoming more natural to what they used to be. Okay. This is all due to the cessation of the dredging and navigation activities? That is correct, in my opinion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct? Correct. And the down-cutting that was necessary related to the construction of that dam? I would say as a result of construction of the dam, yes. And you said to Georgia's counsel that at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable, becoming more natural to what they used to be. Okay. This is all due to the cessation of the dredging and navigation activities? That is correct, in my opinion. Sir, if you could please flip to slide 14 of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	which is titled Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that? 4? The third slide titled Damage in the Upper River. Okay. Yes. If you will recall that Georgia's counsel asked you about down-cutting. Do you recall that? Correct. And where does down-cutting or did down-cutting occur on the river? Down-cutting occurred, you know, for primarily in this particular slide, you know, we're looking at the upper part of the river where it was the 5 feet. And so it's highest right at the dam and decreases as you come down. So, you know, where the where the actual 5 foot occurs, I can't tell you precisely. It is in the upper reaches. This relates to the building of the Woodruff Dam; is that correct? Correct. And the down-cutting that was necessary related to the construction of that dam? I would say as a result of construction of the dam, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q.	are trying to narrow. It's trying to find where it wants to go. So what is the impact today, if we move down to the middle and lower reaches, of down-cutting? In the middle and lower reaches and lower meaning the nontidal lower reach you know, we're in my observations and I'm not the expert on this; but in my observations, I have seen the river elevation the bed of the river come up substantially. And, you know, at low flow, it has come straight up. And why has the bed of the river come straight up? Because we have had a lot of the sand that used to be piled on the banks in the designated areas or on point bars, it's been recaptured. It is becoming more stable because the Corps is no longer creating this artificially deep channel. And, as such, you know, we're starting to get the habitats of the river becoming more stable, becoming more natural to what they used to be. Okay. This is all due to the cessation of the dredging and navigation activities? That is correct, in my opinion.

-		TRIAL - October	31, 2	016 (V	/ol. I) Florida v. Georgia
		229			231
1		same exhibit, which is not one that Georgia's	1	~	system.
2		counsel showed to you. Do you see it's titled	2	Q.	And when you were talking about low flows, are
3		Additional Effects of Low Flows?	3		you just talking about impacts from Corps
4		Correct.	4	_	operations?
5	Q.	Sir, why did you use this slide in this	5	Α.	····· •· •· •
6		presentation?	6		This is something that the State of Florida and,
7	Α.	This slide depicts probably some of the most	7		you know, our agency has for years said that it
8		important habitat that is on the mainstem of the	8		is operations; it is consumptive use upstream.
9		river, root structures. And when you start	9		In fact, it we often refer to it as human
10		dropping the level of the river, more and more of	10		landscape changes or changes in what's happening
11		these roots become dry and not in the water.	11		within the human landscape.
12		These roots provide shelter for a wide range of	12		So, you know, we're we have always talked
13		species. They serve as habitat for what a lot of	13		about, you know, the full everything.
14		species eat, insects. They gather algae, which a	14	Q.	And, sir, if you could actually flip to the last
15		lot of invertebrates need in order to grow, which	15		slide on the presentation
16		then become food for other species. They	16		MS. WINE: It's slide No. 20.
17		stabilize the bank. And, you know, they they	17		The next one, please.
18		also serve as in some areas for some species	18		MS. WINE:
19		of mussels, they serve as a habitat for where you	19	Q.	that says, have we been harmed?
20		can find some species of mussels.	20		Do you see that, sir?
21		And when you start dropping the water level	21	Α.	Yes.
22		down and you start getting down to below 7, 6,	22	Q.	And I see in it starts out, without a doubt,
23		5,000 cfs, you're decreasing you know,	23		yes. And then the next bullet uses the phrase
24		depending on where you are in the river, you can	24		that you just used in your answer. Do you see
25		lose the entire root structure that is available	25		that it says, by human changes in upstream
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		230			232
1		to these species; and so it is totally out of	1	•	landscape?
2		to these species; and so it is totally out of water.	2		landscape? Correct.
2 3		to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water	2 3		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you
2	0	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat.	2 3 4		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide?
2 3 4 5	Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides,	2 3 4 5		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us.
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered;	2 3 4 5 6		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional	2 3 4 5 6 7		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Α.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, what happens that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what is being consumed upstream.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities that we may need to address; but the river is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what is being consumed upstream. And so when I talk about low flows, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities that we may need to address; but the river is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what is being consumed upstream. And so when I talk about low flows, I'm talking about flows that are coming down the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities that we may need to address; but the river is as I indicated, is starting to find its new equilibrium. And as such, you know, while it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what is being consumed upstream. And so when I talk about low flows, I'm talking about flows that are coming down the Apalachicola system. And, you know, it includes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities that we may need to address; but the river is as I indicated, is starting to find its new equilibrium. And as such, you know, while it is finding its new equilibrium, it's still being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what is being consumed upstream. And so when I talk about low flows, I'm talking about flows that are coming down the Apalachicola system. And, you know, it includes the full suite of what is affecting the river	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities that we may need to address; but the river is as I indicated, is starting to find its new equilibrium. And as such, you know, while it is finding its new equilibrium, it's still being affected by low flows. And when we get continued
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q.	to these species; and so it is totally out of water. And, you know, even a 6-inch rise in water provides habitat. But, sir, if you see in the next couple slides, slides 16 and 17 I know they're not numbered; but the next two slides also detail additional effects of low flows. Do you see that? Yes. Why were you focusing on effects of low flows in this presentation? Because, you know, we're starting to see low flows the first part of this talked primarily with what's happening with dredging. And low flows have always been a concern that we have had going back to even, you know, when I first started in state government in the early in the mid-1980's where we have looked at what happens during low flows, which include what is being consumed upstream. And so when I talk about low flows, I'm talking about flows that are coming down the Apalachicola system. And, you know, it includes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	landscape? Correct. And what did you mean by that, and why did you include it in this slide? Again, it's what happens upstream affects us. Whether it is changes in agriculture, whether it's changes in municipal and industrial use, you know, growth, all of these things consume water. And whenever any of those things happen, that amount of water is not available to Florida as part of the river. And, sir, just because there have been restoration activities from the Corps operations on the river, in your view does that mean that there is no continuing harm to the river? Oh, absolutely not. And why is that? When we look at restoration, we're looking at it from a point of view of, you know, are there still things from, you know, dredging activities that we may need to address; but the river is as I indicated, is starting to find its new equilibrium. And as such, you know, while it is finding its new equilibrium, it's still being

		233			235
1		low flows, ones that historically we have never	1		is its largest tributary. And as it comes in,
2		seen, that is a harm to the system.	2		you know, the floodplain is widening out.
3	Q.	And in what way do low flows harm the	3		And so here, you know, we're we're seeing
4		Apalachicola River system?	4		changes in this is the this is the Corps
5		And if it's easier to break it out into the	5		area where the Service has done most of their
6		different reaches of the river, that's fine.	6		work. But this this is where we're starting
7		Whatever is easier for you, sir.	7		to see the widening of the floodplain and, you
8	Α.	In the upper reach, you know, I have indicated	8		know, where we get a lot of a wide variety of
9		that	9		species.
10		THE WITNESS: You know, if I may, sir,	10		And then it starts hitting the tidal reach
11		I'll kind of point these out because these	11		where, again, you're getting 6 miles of
12		are the important ones here.	12		floodplain that goes all the way through there.
13	Α.	These primarily these right in here are spring	13	Q.	And, sir, how is it that persistent and extreme
14		runs. And those are, again, cited by the U.S.	14		low flows are impacting the Apalachicola River
15		Fish and Wildlife Service as part of, you know,	15		today?
16		restoration and planned recovery of the sturgeon	16	Α.	When you start top to bottom, you start losing
17		and are extremely important, you know, because	17		these habitats. You start losing where fish
18		they supply cool water. The same with the	18		spawn. You lose where many of the turtles,
19		striped bass.	19		they're not able to climb up these steep banks in
20		As you move further south and let me also	20		order to nest up in some of the sandy or
21		back up. You also have bank habitat in the upper	21		floodplain areas because, you know, some of them,
22		river. The upper river is really and, in	22		they're this big. And they can't climb up all
23		fact, the entire river you can kind of the	23		this area.
24		reason why it's broken up into all these various	24		We're seeing changes in the within-bank
25		reaches is because it changes in its form.	25		habitat where a lot of mussels and it's not
		THE REPORTING GROUP	_		THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		234			236
1	Q.	Do you need a minute, sir?	1		just the endangered ones. In one of my slides I
2	Α.	The upper river has very steep sides, very narrow	2		have got, you know, some pictures of where and
3		floodplain, which is green. The banks there are	3		I mentioned this earlier where we had
4		very susceptible to changes in flow. And we have	4		long-term tagging at river mile 46.9. It's got
5		got various species that that are only found	5		what is called a hook and bay system where you
6		in that particular reach that are in that little	6		have got the river coming down and then a semi
7		area, that within-bank area.	7		point bar; but it's not it's a straightaway,
8		The middle reach, as the river is coming	8		and it comes down. And the mussels are typically
9		down, it starts to flatten out. You know, upper	9		found on this, you know, out of the current, into
10		reach, it's coming fairly quickly. It's starting	10		the sand, on top of the sand, and back behind.
11		to flatten out. It's in what used to be the	11		And when low flow happens, all of the mussels
12		historic seashore. It's very much sand. And so	12		they have a brain; but their brain is really,
13		this is where you're starting to get a lot of the	13		where is water?
14		share and shows the Andrewsky should be	4.4		And so, yes, they can move. And I was quite
15		changes and sinuosity. And you're starting to	14		
		changes and sinuosity. And you're starting to get what are called loop streams, which are	14 15		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick,
16					
16 17		get what are called loop streams, which are	15		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick,
		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go	15 16		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try
17		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain,	15 16 17		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and
17 18		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back	15 16 17 18		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas
17 18 19		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back into the river maybe 10 miles further down. So	15 16 17 18 19		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas that are going to get very hot. The dissolved
17 18 19 20		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back into the river maybe 10 miles further down. So that water moves all the way across this	15 16 17 18 19 20		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas that are going to get very hot. The dissolved oxygen, which they need to survive on, is going
17 18 19 20 21		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back into the river maybe 10 miles further down. So that water moves all the way across this floodplain as it's going down.	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas that are going to get very hot. The dissolved oxygen, which they need to survive on, is going to get very low. And in many cases, those areas
17 18 19 20 21 22		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back into the river maybe 10 miles further down. So that water moves all the way across this floodplain as it's going down. The lower reach the lower nontidal, again,	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas that are going to get very hot. The dissolved oxygen, which they need to survive on, is going to get very low. And in many cases, those areas will actually dry up and
17 18 19 20 21 22 23		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back into the river maybe 10 miles further down. So that water moves all the way across this floodplain as it's going down. The lower reach the lower nontidal, again, we're flatter. The river changes, and it starts	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas that are going to get very hot. The dissolved oxygen, which they need to survive on, is going to get very low. And in many cases, those areas will actually dry up and And have you seen a change in the pattern of low
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		get what are called loop streams, which are streams that come off of the mainstem. They go out into the floodplain, feed the floodplain, connect with bigger streams, and then come back into the river maybe 10 miles further down. So that water moves all the way across this floodplain as it's going down. The lower reach the lower nontidal, again, we're flatter. The river changes, and it starts to widen out. And it's also starting to get the	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		surprised, you know, they can move pretty quick, some of the species. And they're going to try and find water. And if they go the wrong way and they go behind, they're going to go into areas that are going to get very hot. The dissolved oxygen, which they need to survive on, is going to get very low. And in many cases, those areas will actually dry up and And have you seen a change in the pattern of low flows over the last decade or two?

1	seen more frequent, longer term extreme low
2	flows, close to 5,000 cfs, than we ever have in
3	the historical record.
4	MS. WINE: Your Honor, if I may, this
5	might be a good breaking point for today.
6	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry,
7	counsel?
8	MS. WINE: It's 4:30. I was just saying
9	this might be a good breaking point for
10	today, your Honor.
11	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It's fine by
12	me.
13	MS. WINE: Thank you.
14	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry about
15	it for you.
16	THE WITNESS: I'm here at your pleasure.
17	(Time Noted: 4:34 p.m.)
18	(Proceeding adjourned to Tuesday,
19	November 1, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.)
20	(End of day)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart
	238
	200
1	CERTIFICATE
2	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public
2 3	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify
2 3 4	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct
2 3 4 5	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the
2 3 4	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. <u>/s/ Claudette G. Mason</u>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. <u>/s/ Claudette G. Mason</u> Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. <u>/s/ Claudette G. Mason</u>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. <u>/s/ Claudette G. Mason</u> Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. <u>/s/ Claudette G. Mason</u> Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. /s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter My Commission Expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter My Commission Expires
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the Proceedings. I further certify that I am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 25th day of November, 2016. _/s/ Claudette G. Mason_ Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR Court Reporter My Commission Expires

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	\$	117 [1] - 2:6	1930's [3] - 13:11,	200,000 [1] - 144:3	69:23
	•		22:17, 36:19	2000 [13] - 22:20,	2012 [18] - 14:4, 15:3,
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		119 [1] - 2:24	1931 [3] - 15:4, 15:11,	34:11, 42:15, 132:5,	20:24, 22:21, 27:5,
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	\$335 [1] - 102:2	11:22 [1] - 104:17	22:18	142:25, 185:24,	36:3, 37:2, 37:18,
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		12 [6] - 69:21, 107:18,	1938 [1] - 121:21	186:6, 186:15,	53:1, 53:24, 54:20,
	•	132:21, 149:11,	194 [1] - 2:14	186:18, 191:16,	58:20, 59:23, 76:8,
	'01-'02 [1] - 85:10	192:2, 218:23	1940's [1] - 128:6	222:14, 222:19,	86:18, 87:4, 114:20,
		12(b)(7 [1] - 88:8	1950's [3] - 13:13,	236:25	
		12/9/09 [1] - 205:1	13:25, 36:19	2001 [1] - 222:15	
			1954 [7] - 13:13, 14:2,		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		122 [2] - 152:11,			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		152:24			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				•• •	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	/s [1] - 238:15				
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$ \begin{array}{ $	1				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1 [8] - 119:15, 185:17				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
					,
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
	1.3 [1] - 48:13		••		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	10 [16] - 34:14, 69:13,				
	79:18, 107:18,				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	163:22, 174:9,			168:24, 170:25,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				174:15, 175:5,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				178:16, 178:20,	166:8, 168:9, 202:5,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				179:1, 179:2,	
					24 [9] - 17:21, 18:16,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	••		8:12, 34:8, 121:21		108:11, 108:23,
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					109:2, 109:13,
			21:7, 32:19, 33:6,		109:18, 117:13,
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			33:21, 93:6, 111:1,		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			142:25		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		210:18	1:90CV01331-KOB [1]		
132:21112:21, 113:2, 113:7, 176:8,2217:9, 217:16259 $[2] - 108:14,$ 109:22109 $[2] - 110:3, 110:18$ 113:7, 176:8, 113:7, 176:8,2217:9, 217:16259 $[2] - 108:14,$ 109:2210:05 $[1] - 44:8$ 2003, 200:24, 230:6161 $[1] - 114:14$ 2007 $[12] - 20:23,$ 35:25, 39:23,25th $[1] - 238:11$ 26 $[1] - 105:2511 [7] - 174:14,161 [1] - 114:14137:17, 146:10,179:10, 203:21,16745 [1] - 110:10172:16, 186:18,193:21, 204:4,216:22, 217:16205:8, 208:18168 [1] - 146:13193:21, 204:4,213:9, 213:11,216:22, 217:16209 [3] - 99:1, 99:4,216:22, 217:16110 [2] - 2:20, 2:22206:1, 230:6213:9, 213:11,206:1, 230:62008 [3] - 20:24, 36:2,69:233110 [2] - 187:18,170 [1] - 2:242,000 [2] - 95:12,111:20, 111:25,200 [3] - 20:24, 36:2,69:233111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17,2:22111:20, 111:25,112:3, 161:12,112:3, 161:12,20 [14] - 8:25, 9:5,48:24, 57:2, 74:15,2010 [3] - 60:11,60:25, 79:163112 [3] - 2:21, 146:1818,650,000 [2] - 69:20,143:15101:4, 114:1,$ 158:24, 220:13,2011 $[12] - 14:4, 14:17,$ 217:9, 221:24, 221:14,217:9, 221:24, 221:14,		16 [11] - 99:4, 112:9,	- 154:16		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		112:21, 113:2,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		113:7, 176:8,	2		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		176:11, 176:16,	2 [17] - 14·16 48·5		
$ \begin{array}{c} 161 [1] - 114:14 \\ 19:10, 203:21, \\ 204:21, 205:7, \\ 205:8, 208:18 \\ 110 [2] - 2:20, 2:22 \\ 1100 [2] - 187:18, \\ 188:1 \\ 188:1 \\ 188:1 \\ 111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17, \\ 2:22 \\ 111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17, \\ 112 (3] - 2:21, 146:18 \\ 113 [2] - 2:21, 146:18 \\ 114 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, \\ 2:11 \\ 2$					
$\begin{array}{c} 199:10,\ 203:21,\\ 204:21,\ 205:7,\\ 205:8,\ 208:18\\ 1100\ [2]-\ 2:20,\ 2:22\\ 1100\ [2]-\ 2:20,\ 2:22\\ 1100\ [2]-\ 187:18,\\ 188:1\\ 188:1\\ 188:1\\ 111\ [3]-\ 2:16,\ 2:17,\\ 2:22\\ 111\ [3]-\ 2:17\\ 1120386\ [1]-\ 115:1\\ 113\ [2]-\ 2:21,\ 146:18\\ 18650,000\ [2]-\ 69:20,\\ 114\ [3]-\ 2:12,\ 2:14,\\ 213:15,\ 213:18,\\ 215:2,\ 221:24\\ 101:20\\ 2008\ [3]-\ 20:24,\ 36:2,\\ 69:23\\ 2009\ [6]-\ 97:1,\ 154:8,\\ 101:20\\ 2003\ [1]-\ 97:1,\ 154:8,\\ 101:20\\ 203:12,\ 204:7,\\ 205:16,\ 210:14\\ 150:17,\ 171:2,\\ 112:3,\ 161:12,\\ 179:24,\ 225:2\\ 77:21,\ 84:14,\ 85:24,\\ 101:4,\ 114:1,\\ 113\ [2]-\ 2:21,\ 146:18\\ 18,650,000\ [2]-\ 69:20,\\ 101:4,\ 114:1,\\ 158:24,\ 220:13,\\ 14:21,\ 14:24,\ 15:1,\\ 158:24,\ 220:13,\\ 14:21,\ 14:24,\ 15:1,\\ 225:25\\ 152,\ 211:6\\ 152,\ 17:24,\ 20:24,\\ 3-1\ [1]-\ 109:14\\ \end{array}$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
205:8, 208:18 1687 [1] - 99:20 213:9, 213:11, 2007-2008 [1] - 79:20 21:00 [1] - 100:11 110 [2] - 2:20, 2:22 17 [4] - 81:11, 201:14, 213:15, 213:18, 2008 [3] - 20:24, 36:2, 3 110 [2] - 187:18, 170 [1] - 2:24 2000 [2] - 95:12, 2009 [6] - 97:1, 154:8, 3 [14] - 14:16, 115:22, 111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17, 18 [8] - 2:18, 111:13, 101:20 203:12, 204:7, 121:11, 144:5, 112 [1] - 2:17 112:3, 161:12, 48:24, 57:2, 74:15, 2010 [3] - 60:11, 177:4, 178:16, 113 [2] - 2:21, 146:18 18,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 101:4, 114:1, 2011 [12] - 14:4, 14:17, 217:9, 221:24, 144 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 1800's [1] - 219:17 231:16 15:2, 17:24, 20:24, 3-1 [1] - 109:14					
110 [2] - 2:20, 2:2217 [4] - 81:11, 201:14, 206:1, 230:6213:15, 213:18, 215:2, 221:242008 [3] - 20:24, 36:2, 69:233110 [2] - 187:18, 188:1206:1, 230:6215:2, 221:2469:233188:1170 [1] - 2:242,000 [2] - 95:12, 111:20, 111:25, 112:3, 161:12, 112:3, 161:12,2003 [2] - 95:12, 2003 [2] - 95:12,2009 [6] - 97:1, 154:8, 2003:12, 204:7, 205:16, 210:143 [14] - 14:16, 115:22, 121:11, 144:5,112 [1] - 2:17112:3, 161:12, 179:24, 225:2101:20203:12, 204:7, 205:16, 210:14150:17, 171:2, 150:17, 171:2,112 [0] - 2:21, 146:1818,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 148:15101:4, 148:1, 158:24, 220:13,2011 [12] - 14:4, 14:17, 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 152, 17:24, 20:24,3 [14] - 109:14				2007-2008 [1] - 79:20	 [i] = 103.17
1100 [2] - 187:18, 188:1 170 [1] - 2:24 215:2, 221:24 69:23 111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17, 2:22 170 [1] - 2:24 2,000 [2] - 95:12, 111:20, 111:25, 112:3, 161:12, 112:3, 161:12, 113: [2] - 2:21, 146:18 3 [14] - 14:16, 115:22, 101:20 112 [1] - 2:17 112:3, 161:12, 179:24, 225:2 20[14] - 8:25, 9:5, 179:24, 225:2 205:16, 210:14 150:17, 171:2, 150:17, 171:2, 179:24, 225:2 113 [2] - 2:21, 146:18 18,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 148:15 101:4, 114:1, 101:4, 114:1, 158:24, 220:13, 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 152; 17:24, 20:24, 170:10; 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 225:25 121:11, 14:24, 15:1, 225:25 14:00's [1] - 219:17 231:16 15:2, 17:24, 20:24, 15:2, 17:24, 20:24,			213:15, 213:18,	2008 [3] - 20:24, 36:2,	2
188.1 18 [8] - 2:18, 111:13, 101:20 101:20 203:12, 204:7, 203:12, 204:7, 121:11, 144:5, 101:20 111 [3] - 2:17 111:20, 111:25, 112:3, 161:12, 179:24, 225:2 101:20 203:12, 204:7, 121:11, 144:5, 150:17, 171:2, 112:3, 161:12, 179:24, 225:2 112 [3] - 2:21, 146:18 18,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 101:4, 114:1, 123:16 101:4, 114:1, 123:16, 113:2, 123:11, 144:17, 121:20, 205:11, 179:24, 225:2 114 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 2:21 18,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 148:14, 85:24, 200:13, 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 125:25 178:20, 205:11, 123:11, 144:25, 125:25 114 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 2:21 18,00's [1] - 219:17 231:16 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 125:1, 125:25	1100 [2] - 187:18,			69:23	5
111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17, 111:20, 111:25, 101:20 101:20 1203:12, 204:7, 121:11, 144:0, 2:22 111:20, 111:25, 112:3, 161:12, 120 [14] - 8:25, 9:5, 205:16, 210:14 150:17, 171:2, 112 [1] - 2:17 112:3, 161:12, 48:24, 57:2, 74:15, 2010 [3] - 60:11, 171:4, 178:16, 113 [2] - 2:21, 146:18 18,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 101:4, 114:1, 2011 [12] - 14:4, 14:17, 217:9, 221:24, 114 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 1800's [1] - 219:17 231:16 15:2, 17:24, 20:24, 3-1 [1] - 109:14	188:1				
2:22 112:3, 161:12, 12:3, 161:12, 12:3, 161:12, 13:23, 16:12, 13:23, 16:12, 13	111 [3] - 2:16, 2:17,				
112 [1] - 2:17 179:24, 225:2 140:24, 37.2, 74.13, 77:21, 84:14, 85:24, 178:20, 77:21, 84:14, 85:24, 178:20, 205:11, 178:20, 205:1	2:22				
1120386 [1] - 115:1 18,650,000 [2] - 69:20, 177.21, 64.14, 65.24, 100.23, 75.16 177.20, 203.11, 113 [2] - 2:21, 146:18 148:15 101:4, 114:1, 2011 [12] - 14:4, 14:17, 217:9, 221:24, 144 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 148:15 158:24, 220:13, 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 225:25 1800's [1] - 219:17 231:16 15:2, 17:24, 20:24, 3-1 [1] - 109:14	112 [1] - 2:17				
113 [2] - 2.21, 140.18 148:15 101.4, 114.1, 158:24, 220:13, 158:24, 220:13, 158:24, 220:13, 158:24, 220:13, 158:24, 220:13, 158:24, 220:14, 158:24, 20:24, 158:24, 158:	1120386 [1] - 115:1				
114 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 1800's [1] - 219:17 231:16 14:21, 14:24, 15:1, 220:23 114 [3] - 2:12, 2:14, 231:16 15:2, 17:24, 20:24, 3-1 [1] - 109:14					
115 [2] - 2:12, 2:18 THE REPORTING GROUP 39:23, 57:23, 3-3 [1] - 109:7		19 [1] - 165·14			
	115 [2] - 2:12, 2:18	THI	E REPORTING G	KOUP 39:23, 57:23,	ວ-ວ [1] - 109:7
Mason & Lockhart		M	lason & Lockha		

61 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart —

r	1		1	
3-4 [1] - 108:24	187:10, 191:11	6-1/2 [1] - 48:17	44:10, 79:18,	acquaintance [1] -
3-6 [3] - 18:21, 109:13,	46 [1] - 35:8	6-inch [1] - 230:3	104:17, 237:19	151:4
109:18	46.9 [1] - 236:4	60 [2] - 26:4, 166:15	abandoning [1] -	acquire [1] - 39:2
3-9 [3] - 18:16, 109:4,	47 [1] - 214:3	60's [2] - 128:10,	215:21	acreage [5] - 23:19,
109:7	4700 [1] - 186:19	220:1	abatement [3] - 79:13,	33:22, 34:20, 35:21,
30 [7] - 36:25, 42:11,	477297 [1] - 112:24	61 [2] - 168:6, 168:9	80:18, 100:23	85:9
91:19, 117:5,	477298 [1] - 113:4	6200 [1] - 211:8	Abid [1] - 3:17	acres [5] - 35:18, 39:3,
152:17, 159:2,	477308 [1] - 113:8	6300 [5] - 206:25,	ABID [1] - 1:18	40:13, 40:18, 40:23
166:15	48 [3] - 178:7, 179:7,	208:20, 209:2,	ability [1] - 209:22	Act [19] - 22:4, 34:12,
30(b)(6 [2] - 145:4,	216:9	209:6, 209:8	able [4] - 134:23,	34:18, 34:20, 35:17,
145:15		65 [4] - 110:3, 110:6,	138:16, 193:4,	35:23, 36:2, 36:5,
30,000 [1] - 210:1	49b [1] - 37:23 49d1 [1] - 36:10	110:9, 110:13	235:19	37:5, 37:17, 42:15,
30-year [1] - 25:17	4:30 [1] - 237:8	66 [2] - 113:11, 113:19	above-entitled [1] -	79:16, 85:8, 86:22,
300 [1] - 14:13	4:34 [1] - 237:17	675 [1] - 101:25	1:10	86:24, 159:21,
307-MD-1 [1] - 213:5	4.34 [1] - 237.17	69 [2] - 37:13, 115:4	above-named [1] -	199:4, 203:24,
309 [1] - 213:3	E	09[2] - 57.15, 115.4	238:9	213:24
31 [4] - 1:13, 170:25,	5	7	absence [1] - 88:18	act [1] - 34:9
171:1, 212:11	5 [16] - 14:2, 48:4,	I	absolutely [9] - 67:6,	acting [1] - 182:25
310 [1] - 210:9	123:16, 123:19,	7 [8] - 12:4, 23:12,	144:15, 186:2,	action [10] - 9:14,
315 [1] - 101:8	124:5, 124:8,	173:6, 179:9,	188:19, 193:14,	34:10, 34:13, 38:17,
33 [1] - 2:16	125:16, 126:2,	181:14, 186:13,	196:20, 217:8,	52:15, 69:19, 70:2,
339 [1] - 154:16	158:3, 172:15,	187:7, 229:22	232:16, 236:25	85:5, 157:4, 238:9
339 [1] - 134.10 34 [1] - 2:16	176:3, 200:3,	7's [1] - 155:16	absurdity [1] - 75:23	Action [2] - 38:18,
34 [1] - 2.16 35 [5] - 2:19, 80:9,	226:14, 226:16,	70 [2] - 10:18, 81:18	abundance [3] -	39:17
33 [5] - 2.19, 80.9, 194:15, 194:18,	227:6	70's [1] - 220:2	140:4, 140:8, 146:23	actions [4] - 53:5,
194.13, 194.18, 195:1	5,000 [10] - 76:20,	70.6 [1] - 16:20	abundant [3] - 62:7,	118:25, 119:13,
35-50 [1] - 194:13	89:4, 91:10, 93:5,	72 [1] - 127:6	70:4, 148:5	160:7
36 [4] - 2:20, 115:12,	202:3, 206:5, 206:9,	75 [2] - 82:2, 104:3	academic [1] - 50:14	activities [14] - 66:21,
115:19, 164:15	216:14, 229:23,		accept [3] - 196:8,	129:5, 129:12,
37 [1] - 2:12	237:2	8	213:20, 215:12	132:5, 141:13,
38 [3] - 2:19, 167:2,	50 [8] - 7:18, 11:6,	9 ruo 77:04 464:44	accepting [1] - 103:15	160:11, 160:13,
168:10	45:15, 90:4, 97:22,	8 [10] - 77:21, 161:11,	accepts [1] - 99:25	172:8, 199:12,
383 [2] - 170:7, 170:16	194:15, 194:18,	173:5, 191:23,	access [4] - 16:15,	199:14, 218:11,
384-1 [1] - 158:19	195:1	197:12, 197:13, 107:24, 107:25	134:2, 134:7, 135:11	228:23, 232:13,
39 [5] - 2:13, 168:23,	50's [2] - 128:9, 220:1	197:24, 197:25,	accessible [1] -	232:20
169:5, 169:6, 169:11	51 [1] - 165:16	199:11, 202:5 80 [5] - 45:6, 82:2,	159:14	activity [2] - 47:21,
3:10 [1] - 192:25	5100 [2] - 186:13,		accident [2] - 51:5,	222:19
3:21 [1] - 193:2	191:11	126:22, 126:25, 129:4	79:4	actual [5] - 22:25,
	53 [1] - 220:18	85 [2] - 114:19, 114:24	according [2] -	50:23, 51:4, 107:8,
4	537 [1] - 1:12	850 [1] - 102:3	147:20, 197:2	226:16
	53B [1] - 221:18	UUU [1] = 102.0	account [2] - 72:19,	Adam [4] - 150:7,
4 [6] - 33:14, 79:18,	54 [2] - 53:3, 55:24	9	82:1	150:9, 150:25, 151:9
111:5, 111:8,	5400 [1] - 206:13		accurate [3] - 187:19,	add [2] - 140:23,
154:11, 226:3	545 [1] - 100:24	9 [9] - 128:8, 203:21,	187:20, 227:4	157:12
4,000 [1] - 77:18	55244 [1] - 113:20	204:1, 204:7,	accurately [1] - 94:2	addition [4] - 91:17,
40 [5] - 77:20, 129:9,	5600 [3] - 187:14,	204:13, 210:14,	ACF [18] - 9:12, 14:6,	125:10, 162:22,
138:10, 176:18	191:11, 209:10	213:1, 213:3, 238:17	14:12, 40:9, 47:25,	174:17
414-3 [1] - 163:21	57 [1] - 119:10	9.4 [1] - 152:24	48:1, 48:3, 48:21,	Additional [1] - 229:3
42 [2] - 205:25, 208:19	5700 [1] - 211:3	90 [2] - 201:22, 201:24	49:15, 75:8, 121:5,	additional [11] -
428 [1] - 215:4	-	90,000 [2] - 40:18,	165:22, 166:2,	89:13, 91:3, 93:23,
430 [5] - 210:16,	6	40:23	172:20, 174:17,	100:25, 102:4,
210:18, 210:20,	6 [10] - 12:4, 69:19,	98806 [1] - 111:21	188:22, 188:23,	109:17, 125:13,
211:1, 211:25	159:5, 170:3, 170:5,	98807 [1] - 112:4	205:21	137:18, 156:11,
432 [1] - 215:7	170:15, 170:18,	98980 [1] - 114:16	achieve [1] - 41:17	209:25, 230:7
433 [3] - 212:4, 212:5,	182:10, 229:22,	9:00 [1] - 237:19	achieving [1] - 82:15	address [10] - 46:18,
215:7	235:11	9:09 [1] - 1:14	Achilles [1] - 34:3	47:2, 74:25, 78:15,
437 [1] - 208:5	6,000 [2] - 13:17,		acknowledge [2] -	84:5, 91:18, 93:25,
44.3 [1] - 201:18	13:22	Α	85:17, 152:12	135:8, 223:1, 232:21
440 [1] - 215:4			acknowledged [2] -	addressed [3] - 80:20,
4500 [3] - 186:16,	6,009,000 [1] - 148 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP , 65:21	107:8, 151:17
	N	• Iason & Lockha	nt	
	1.			62 of 93 shoo

addresses [2] -	146:2, 146:16,	134:16, 134:17	200:20, 207:19,	applied [1] - 112:18
109:25, 114:19	151:22, 194:10,	allowed [8] - 41:22,	207:24, 231:24	apply [1] - 41:23
adequate [2] - 32:5,	195:7, 222:23	59:13, 84:7, 130:10,	answering [1] -	apportionment [10] -
96:17	agree [29] - 16:7,	157:21, 201:6,	140:17	8:18, 8:19, 8:23,
adequately [1] -	41:14, 56:5, 58:14,	215:20, 223:6	answers [3] - 72:5,	9:14, 38:17, 45:3,
151:17	125:14, 135:21,	allowing [1] - 134:25	168:7, 168:21	45:23, 46:23, 52:20,
adjacent [1] - 127:24	144:16, 146:24,	almost [3] - 39:8,	anthropogenic [1] -	94:14
adjourned [1] - 237:18	155:11, 156:3,	102:13, 202:15	66:18	appreciate [3] - 44:17,
admission [2] - 19:16,	162:24, 165:2,	alone [3] - 16:19,	anticipate [1] - 7:18	140:25, 192:23
68:4	165:20, 167:21,	19:15, 52:19	anticipated [1] - 10:11	approach [7] - 94:23,
admit [1] - 68:11	169:11, 173:2,	alterations [2] - 188:8,	anytime [1] - 179:1	107:5, 107:11,
admits [1] - 99:3	188:5, 189:14,	189:4	Apalachicola [90] -	117:6, 152:1,
admitted [4] - 51:25,	191:2, 191:17,	altered [2] - 60:22,	5:1, 5:6, 8:5, 8:11,	163:13, 207:20
68:11, 68:17, 73:24	192:23, 193:4,	166:14	12:19, 12:22, 13:4,	appropriate [6] -
adopt [3] - 86:8,	194:24, 195:16,	alternatives [1] -	19:23, 20:1, 20:21,	41:15, 42:22, 42:23,
105:23, 117:13	196:12, 206:1,	95:11	22:16, 23:1, 23:8,	93:2, 131:16, 196:8
adopted [3] - 84:19,	208:24, 216:10,	ambiguity [1] - 11:16	23:23, 24:7, 26:3,	appropriated [1] -
86:2, 93:9	216:19	ameliorated [1] -	29:4, 29:24, 30:5,	37:8
advanced [3] - 52:23,	agricultural [17] -	144:18	31:6, 42:9, 42:21,	approval [2] - 83:4,
54:1, 217:17	11:4, 15:25, 18:12,	amend [1] - 86:24	43:12, 43:14, 44:25,	216:13
advances [1] - 69:5	33:5, 35:6, 36:14,	Amended [1] - 154:13	53:6, 53:8, 53:19,	approved [7] - 150:12,
advancing [1] - 174:1	46:17, 47:10, 48:12,	Amit [1] - 4:22	55:7, 56:8, 56:9,	150:13, 150:16,
adverse [1] - 173:21	75:4, 86:15, 87:23,	amount [20] - 11:3,	57:15, 58:9, 65:2,	150:22, 151:20,
adversely [4] - 73:5,	97:23, 98:12, 99:14,	11:7, 19:12, 33:5,	66:19, 67:16, 69:4,	214:10, 224:14
155:14, 165:22,	99:18, 100:2	34:22, 49:7, 49:17,	70:4, 71:9, 72:25,	April [3] - 53:20,
166:21	Agriculture [1] - 25:19	75:6, 75:8, 76:12,	73:18, 74:12, 77:17,	54:12, 165:3
adviser [2] - 38:3, 38:4	agriculture [6] - 87:8,	76:13, 98:22,	77:19, 96:13, 96:16,	aptly [1] - 90:12
affect [1] - 78:10	90:5, 98:19, 98:25,	101:13, 168:2,	96:21, 118:12,	aquatic [2] - 66:9,
affected [2] - 214:8,	100:12, 232:6	187:17, 187:21,	120:14, 121:3,	96:19
232:25	ahead [1] - 183:23	191:7, 224:15,	121:7, 121:16,	Aquifer [4] - 16:14,
affecting [3] - 166:21,	aimed [1] - 87:3	232:10	138:8, 144:14,	17:18, 18:2, 83:24
195:4, 230:25	Alabama [8] - 8:8,	amounts [1] - 41:6	149:5, 160:7, 161:3,	aquifer [3] - 16:15,
affects [1] - 232:5	153:25, 154:17,	amphibian [1] - 74:3	161:15, 164:1,	16:18, 83:25
afternoon [5] -	155:21, 163:20,	amphibians [1] - 30:6	167:16, 167:18,	aquifers [4] - 16:11,
106:14, 106:16,	170:6, 198:12, 208:3	anadromous [3] -	167:22, 168:16,	16:13, 39:6, 84:3
169:18, 218:6, 218:8	algae [1] - 229:14	133:22, 134:18,	168:19, 172:21,	area [28] - 17:8, 18:4,
Agarway [1] - 4:22	Allan [13] - 30:9,	223:7	176:3, 177:15,	43:17, 43:18, 48:23,
AGARWAY [1] - 4:22	30:16, 67:8, 67:20,	analyses [2] - 98:18,	177:17, 180:25,	69:16, 69:19, 70:2,
	68:9, 68:23, 69:5,	100:9	181:3, 181:17,	81:18, 138:15,
agencies [5] - 62:20,	71:2, 71:6, 71:11,	analysis [8] - 50:25,	185:4, 186:19,	139:3, 148:12,
64:25, 65:13, 66:23,	71:22, 97:6, 98:2	55:2, 68:15, 71:17,	188:23, 194:19,	149:3, 176:4, 189:8,
160:5	Allan's [4] - 30:12,	73:20, 98:21, 99:1,	199:20, 199:23,	189:13, 189:17,
Agency [1] - 79:8	31:23, 73:23, 99:1	101:6	201:12, 201:18,	195:13, 197:5,
agency [9] - 64:21,	allegation [6] - 51:15,	analyze [1] - 119:5	206:4, 211:24,	220:21, 220:23,
87:24, 119:5, 119:8,	56:1, 84:6, 155:17,	animal [1] - 118:20	212:6, 216:14,	221:18, 221:19,
119:12, 148:21,	155:18, 156:4	animals [2] - 62:15,	217:22, 218:18,	221:21, 234:7,
152:13, 215:16,	alleged [6] - 51:3,	67:10	222:2, 230:24,	235:5, 235:23
231:7	53:4, 55:23, 62:14,	annual [4] - 49:4,	233:4, 235:14	areas [36] - 10:6, 20:8,
agency's [1] - 152:12	155:11, 173:4		Apalachicola's [1] -	23:5, 64:9, 86:11,
aggrade [3] - 195:25,	alleges [2] - 61:12,	75:10, 75:15, 96:16	204:2	127:22, 127:24,
196:5, 196:24	83:1	answer [29] - 10:4,	apparent [1] - 202:21	129:3, 130:9,
aggrades [1] - 196:11	alleging [1] - 166:20	52:4, 54:16, 54:23,	appear [1] - 151:16	130:21, 133:22,
aggressive [1] - 79:11	Allen [1] - 6:8	56:11, 56:18, 59:5,	APPEARANCES [1] -	134:3, 135:11,
aggressively [2] -	ALLEN [2] - 1:22, 6:9	68:2, 72:3, 92:2,	1:16	136:13, 138:11,
80:19, 86:14	alleviate [1] - 94:9	129:18, 132:25,	appearances [1] - 3:8	147:2, 165:23,
ago [21] - 26:23, 45:6,	allocate [1] - 8:8	140:19, 141:9,	appearing [1] - 6:3	166:24, 167:5,
65:19, 69:10, 69:12,	allocation [1] - 88:6	156:14, 157:11,	appendix [7] - 171:10,	168:12, 172:7,
69:25, 70:13, 70:21,	ALLON [2] - 1:21, 6:5	158:15, 163:25,	204:10, 204:16,	219:7, 219:8, 221:6,
75:24, 95:19, 96:6,		164:11, 167:25,	204:23, 205:6,	225:1, 225:2, 225:6,
100:5, 128:21,	Allon [1] - 6:4	168:15, 168:18, F PEPOPUTNC C	ROUP ³ , 215:2	225:14, 225:15,
142:16, 146:1,	allow [3] - 26:20, TH	E REPORTING G		<i>LL</i> U. 17, <i>LL</i> U. 10,
	M	lason & Lockha	art	
	1.		-	

63 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart.

225:18, 227:15,	206:21	authors [5] - 28:20,	206:24, 209:15	53:19, 56:8, 56:9,
228:16, 229:18,	assumptions [2] -	29:1, 55:6, 58:2,	Barr's [4] - 205:9,	57:15, 59:10, 96:21,
235:21, 236:18,	151:13, 152:22	59:1	205:24, 208:17,	194:19
236:21	astronomically [1] -	available [8] - 23:18,	209:20	bear [2] - 88:12, 91:4
Areas [4] - 127:13,	80:23	164:4, 164:9,	bars [4] - 59:14,	bears [1] - 77:10
127:15, 127:20,	Atlanta [33] - 10:9,	167:23, 167:24,	123:3, 130:18,	beautiful [1] - 31:19
128:18	12:4, 23:10, 39:20,	223:9, 229:25,	228:16	beauty [2] - 23:15,
argue [1] - 42:22	39:22, 41:19, 42:2,	232:10	Bars [1] - 60:4	43:16
argued [2] - 88:20,	47:9, 48:22, 48:24,	average [9] - 13:16,	Barton [3] - 91:18,	became [5] - 15:24,
173:20	50:15, 78:19, 78:24,	48:17, 49:4, 75:10,	91:19, 92:6	16:24, 42:16, 62:2,
argues [1] - 28:10	79:2, 79:5, 79:20,	75:18, 76:1, 96:3,	base [1] - 68:24	73:7
arguing [1] - 46:15	79:25, 80:17, 80:19,	96:16, 99:7	based [17] - 8:6, 9:1,	become [7] - 24:11,
argument [3] - 28:1,	81:12, 81:18, 82:1,	averaging [1] - 14:13	27:2, 56:3, 69:15,	34:7, 44:20, 72:11,
72:21, 104:1	82:10, 82:25, 83:3,	avoid [1] - 23:20	102:14, 148:11,	184:20, 229:11,
Army [56] - 8:14, 50:7,	83:10, 83:15, 99:13,	aware [6] - 64:22,	149:3, 158:16,	229:16
64:1, 72:20, 73:9,	100:21, 100:23,	94:15, 146:5, 189:6,	160:14, 165:8,	becomes [2] - 24:15,
76:19, 77:4, 78:2,	101:3, 101:7	195:23, 203:10	167:9, 187:9,	121:7
81:16, 83:5, 83:7,	Atlanta's [3] - 80:14,		206:18, 209:1,	becoming [3] -
88:5, 88:14, 88:22,	80:15, 82:23	В	209:5, 213:23	228:17, 228:20,
88:25, 89:14, 89:19,	Atlantic [1] - 112:16	hook to hook in	baseless [1] - 61:16	228:21
90:20, 91:8, 91:18,	attached [4] - 184:25,	back-to-back [1] -	basic [3] - 49:2,	bed [8] - 143:4, 162:4,
91:22, 92:1, 92:5,	204:22, 205:10,	86:20	149:13, 151:11	190:12, 225:16,
92:11, 92:14, 92:18,	213:1	background [2] -	Basin [33] - 9:12,	227:13, 227:16,
93:10, 93:22, 96:10,	attachment [4] -	67:1, 108:7	10:23, 11:2, 11:3,	228:9, 228:12
103:14, 118:25,	181:18, 185:2,	backup [1] - 90:10	12:3, 14:6, 14:12,	Bedient [2] - 22:13,
129:21, 130:15,	185:4, 190:20	bad [4] - 13:24, 16:2,	18:4, 18:5, 19:3,	89:11
131:4, 133:14,	attachments [1] -	61:9, 217:6	20:2, 33:9, 34:23,	began [1] - 84:22
144:11, 154:5,	179:13	Bainbridge [7] -	35:7, 35:12, 35:19,	begin [1] - 118:3
154:15, 155:10,	attempt [2] - 67:8,	18:23, 18:24, 18:25,	37:16, 38:2, 40:9,	beginning [8] - 14:15,
155:21, 164:17,	67:22	19:1, 19:11, 218:17,	40:18, 41:3, 42:21,	32:19, 49:11, 75:9,
165:4, 177:14,	attempted [2] - 52:1,	219:1	43:15, 47:25, 48:2,	84:20, 88:7, 95:4,
180:14, 180:16,	73:22	balance [1] - 46:14	49:15, 71:9, 86:9,	217:5
199:13, 203:8,	attendant [1] - 166:14	balanced [1] - 87:22	113:15, 113:25,	begins [2] - 50:25,
208:9, 208:14,	attended [1] - 38:12	balancing [3] - 46:25,	121:5, 174:17,	121:3
208:16, 209:16,	attendees [1] - 4:12	74:22, 103:7	205:21	behalf [1] - 44:15
209:21, 209:24,	attention [8] - 21:1,	ban [3] - 79:17, 79:19,	basin [15] - 10:7,	behind [4] - 64:9,
210:25, 214:16,	44:17, 49:3, 146:22,	80:22	13:14, 14:18, 14:24,	121:1, 236:10,
216:20	155:2, 165:15,	bank [7] - 143:8,	15:9, 20:5, 36:16,	236:18
arrived [1] - 59:5	168:6, 198:24	144:7, 225:5,	48:12, 52:9, 62:17,	believes [2] - 19:13,
article [1] - 110:19	attitude [1] - 60:10	229:17, 233:21,	75:13, 76:18, 86:17,	28:11
Article [1] - 23:11	attorney [2] - 5:5,	234:7, 235:24	88:6, 97:13	below [9] - 13:22,
articulate [1] - 103:12	43:13	bankclimber [7] -	basins [1] - 10:14	16:11, 20:18, 20:21,
articulated [1] - 46:22	attorneys [3] - 57:13,	67:18, 68:14, 68:16,	basis [2] - 45:25,	21:1, 21:2, 21:14,
artificially [1] - 228:18	57:17, 57:21	155:14, 171:20,	94:24	162:6, 229:22
Aschauer [2] - 3:20,	attributable [2] - 9:3,	172:10, 199:8	bass [3] - 134:9,	Bend [1] - 223:13
5:17	143:14	bankclimbers [1] -	142:4, 233:19	bend [3] - 138:13,
ASCHAUER [3] - 1:18,	Auburn [3] - 149:25,	167:5	Bates [1] - 179:13	220:17, 224:9
3:22, 5:18	150:1, 153:7	Bankruptcy [1] - 1:12	Battle [1] - 223:13	bends [1] - 221:4
aside [2] - 23:20,	auction [1] - 86:22	banks [5] - 143:11,	bay [24] - 24:11,	benefit [7] - 44:25,
42:20	auctions [1] - 85:9	222:4, 228:15,	24:18, 24:19, 24:25,	76:5, 80:25, 82:18,
assembly [1] - 85:7	August [5] - 21:3,	234:3, 235:19	25:6, 25:17, 26:9,	90:6, 218:20, 219:11
assertion [1] - 58:8	59:23, 148:17,	bar [1] - 236:7	26:17, 27:23, 29:12,	benefits [1] - 46:5
Assessment [1] -	186:15, 186:18	BARACK [1] - 1:23	29:21, 36:23, 59:17,	berms [1] - 131:18
59:23	author [2] - 65:9,	Barack [1] - 6:14	61:10, 61:13, 61:19,	Berndt [1] - 181:21
assist [1] - 176:7	110:20	barely [4] - 47:1,	61:25, 62:4, 62:5,	Berrigan [5] - 25:16,
assistance [1] -	authored [1] - 59:20	48:17, 79:1, 206:14	62:8, 97:8, 98:3,	25:22, 29:10, 59:20,
183:11	authorization [1] -	Barnes [1] - 8:15	98:20, 236:5	59:22
associated [1] -	156:10	Barr [8] - 96:11, 96:15,	Bay [15] - 8:5, 23:1,	beside [1] - 12:10
181:17	authorized [3] - 53:5.	204:22, 205:14,	23:23, 29:4, 42:9,	best [1] - 45:5
assume [2] - 182:21,	128:6, 218:16 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP 53:6, 53:8,	better [7] - 52:9,
	, <u> </u>	-		

Mason & Lockhart -

62:10, 82:21, 85:12,	221:21, 225:15	bringing [1] - 81:7	cannot [8] - 44:21,	214:22
86:16, 176:8	blow [3] - 131:2,	brings [1] - 91:15	51:7, 52:20, 91:14,	cases [6] - 45:23,
Between [1] - 113:14	138:5, 216:7	brink [1] - 69:7	103:12, 144:21,	51:10, 94:14, 198:4,
between [22] - 17:13,	blowup [1] - 217:21	Britt [1] - 6:24	150:15, 163:4	198:19, 236:21
19:5, 26:17, 31:24,	blue [5] - 49:6, 65:7,	broken [1] - 233:24	cap [22] - 33:10, 41:5,	casually [1] - 102:7
37:24, 47:24, 53:23,	76:13, 82:8, 82:10	brought [1] - 157:18	41:12, 41:15, 46:11,	Cat [1] - 60:4
54:14, 54:19, 55:7,	blunt [1] - 37:7	budgets [1] - 110:1	46:15, 49:24, 50:10,	catalogued [1] - 64:12
55:12, 55:20, 58:19,	boat [2] - 227:17,		68:5, 75:25, 76:3,	catastrophe [1] - 69:7
79:17, 81:21, 82:2,	227:18	Buford [2] - 174:17,	77:6, 89:12, 94:3,	categories [1] - 75:3
84:23, 86:12, 91:6,		199:22	94:25, 95:5, 95:19,	categories [1] - 75.3 catwalk [1] - 120:21
142:23, 191:10,	boats [1] - 227:15	build [2] - 72:12,	96:6, 112:17, 206:5,	
203:8	book [7] - 117:21,	85:13	206:9	causation [2] - 46:24,
beyond [1] - 47:22	119:15, 146:11,	building [2] - 123:7,	capacity [1] - 83:9	74:20
big [2] - 131:12,	150:17, 170:3,	226:19	capita [3] - 80:1, 80:7,	caused [20] - 9:2,
235:22	179:9, 193:20	built [4] - 46:9, 73:8,	80:8	16:8, 26:9, 46:10,
	booklet [1] - 158:3	77:5, 122:19		51:13, 54:24, 55:25,
bigger [3] - 18:25,	bookshelf [1] - 22:10	built-in [1] - 77:5	capped [2] - 83:21,	56:9, 58:9, 65:5,
34:3, 234:18	boomed [1] - 23:10	bullet [6] - 40:12,	94:5	66:16, 66:20, 68:10,
biggest [1] - 218:21	border [7] - 51:23,	123:14, 128:1,	caption [2] - 178:14,	70:8, 72:11, 124:10,
Bill [2] - 28:11, 54:2	63:22, 77:14, 90:15,	128:17, 139:17,	197:18	133:13, 136:18,
billion [3] - 48:14,	120:24, 121:25,	231:23	Cardozo [2] - 45:5,	166:15, 189:24
102:5	122:9	burden [5] - 44:22,	71:19	causes [4] - 38:8,
billions [2] - 47:20,	borders [1] - 77:15	52:22, 74:23, 88:13,	care [1] - 192:14	136:13, 161:25,
82:18	Boston [1] - 49:1	102:25	career [1] - 118:11	196:15
binder [3] - 154:11,	bottom [17] - 24:13,	buried [2] - 202:22,	careful [1] - 83:6	causing [5] - 29:6,
191:23, 203:22	48:12, 49:9, 53:13,	203:2	Carol [1] - 86:4	36:21, 59:17, 78:24,
binders [1] - 107:7	115:8, 126:23,	buy [3] - 34:5, 35:21,	carry [1] - 31:2	162:23
biodiversity [1] -	136:8, 138:19,	37:9	cascading [2] - 61:13,	center [2] - 11:4, 17:6
74:11	139:21, 146:22,	BY [30] - 105:22,	61:17	central [2] - 27:21,
biological [13] - 72:18,	150:22, 172:17,	117:10, 118:7,	case [88] - 6:3, 8:14,	27:22
73:1, 93:17, 95:22,	193:24, 194:3,	120:3, 126:4, 127:7,	8:20, 9:5, 11:11,	certain [5] - 46:4,
96:20, 97:13,	194:12, 214:4,	131:3, 132:9,	11:20, 13:8, 15:16,	46:12, 130:18,
145:24, 146:14,	235:16	132:23, 133:6,	17:24, 19:16, 22:2,	147:2, 188:6
148:24, 152:7,	bouncing [1] - 97:18	137:2, 138:6, 145:2,	22:14, 27:11, 28:1,	certainly [6] - 29:15,
152:11, 193:21,	boundaries [1] -	146:21, 157:16,	29:23, 32:11, 32:12,	102:13, 155:7,
194:5	131:16	159:16, 163:14,	33:12, 34:4, 37:19,	163:25, 198:10,
biologist [6] - 55:19,	boxes [1] - 13:6	170:1, 170:10,	38:7, 40:14, 42:5,	207:18
97:14, 117:2, 117:4,	boy [1] - 22:19	176:12, 177:2,	44:18, 44:22, 46:9,	CERTIFICATE [1] -
118:9, 152:15	brain [2] - 236:12	178:13, 179:15,	47:12, 49:23, 50:11,	238:1
biologist's [1] -	Brandt [2] - 180:16,	193:15, 197:14,	50:25, 51:18, 52:17,	certified [1] - 201:5
152:19	180:18	213:6, 216:8, 217:3,	52:21, 55:16, 56:13,	certify [2] - 238:3,
Biota [1] - 133:17	breached [1] - 87:14	218:5, 231:18	56:14, 57:2, 57:11,	238:7
bird [1] - 74:1	break [4] - 169:17,		57:21, 62:12, 62:24,	cessation [2] - 223:1,
bit [9] - 7:13, 14:8,	169:18, 192:7, 233:5	С	63:1, 65:17, 66:15,	228:22
26:22, 85:17, 113:7,	breaking [2] - 237:5,		68:4, 70:7, 72:6,	cfs [39] - 13:18, 13:22,
129:10, 162:3,	237:9	cage [1] - 25:8	77:10, 88:8, 88:20,	14:13, 14:14, 14:16,
175:7, 183:20	breaks [1] - 126:6	cages [3] - 25:4,	89:23, 92:12, 92:16,	16:22, 76:21, 77:18,
blame [1] - 60:13	breed [1] - 30:7	26:16, 26:20	92:24, 93:21, 94:15,	89:4, 91:10, 93:5,
blamed [1] - 167:14	breeding [1] - 31:12	calculated [4] - 19:14,	95:5, 95:9, 103:5,	95:12, 95:13, 99:20,
blaming [2] - 54:21,	brief [17] - 27:25, 42:4,	149:14, 224:16	103:20, 117:12,	99:24, 100:13,
78:2	51:3, 53:11, 56:22,	Caldwell [14] - 2:4,	132:10, 145:5,	100:25, 101:8,
blasted [2] - 162:24,	73:15, 78:25, 81:10,	18:7, 33:19, 87:11,	153:8, 153:19,	101:17, 101:20,
164:6	81:11, 81:23, 83:16,	87:12, 107:25,	154:7, 154:15,	101:25, 102:3,
block [1] - 135:11	170:23, 171:2,	108:6, 110:19,	154:24, 155:20,	186:16, 186:19,
blocked [3] - 64:9,	170.23, 171.2, 172:4, 212:25,	111:15, 112:23,	156:9, 157:17,	187:18, 188:2,
134:3, 134:7		113:13, 114:21,	158:9, 163:6,	191:11, 202:3,
blocking [1] - 139:8	214:3, 217:12 briefing (1) - 203:23	114:25, 116:1	163:16, 163:20,	206:5, 206:9,
blocks [1] - 21:20	briefing [1] - 203:23	Caldwell's [1] - 112:8	172:1, 173:7, 174:4,	206:14, 206:25,
Blountstown [7] -	briefly [2] - 87:12,	call-outs [1] - 159:12	181:8, 182:22,	208:20, 209:2,
	108:14	candidly [1] - 37:11	188:14, 198:13,	209:6, 211:3,
127:1, 127:2, 129:7, 219:18, 220:12,	bring [2] - 99:1, 224·24 TH		ROUP 5, 213:5,	216:14, 229:23,
213.10, 220.12,	224:24 THI		I	,,
	M	ason & Lockha	rt	

65 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

-	1			1
237:2	219:18, 219:21,	173:8, 233:14	111:24, 112:20,	134:13, 159:19,
chain [2] - 61:19, 62:7	219:25, 227:5,	cites [6] - 81:23,	113:1, 114:3,	182:4, 199:2, 238:17
chair [2] - 28:6, 57:3	228:18	172:24, 211:12,	114:11, 114:13,	Commission's [1] -
challenge [1] - 38:18	channelization [6] -	215:1, 224:14	114:16, 114:23,	165:4
challenges [1] - 78:15	128:2, 128:5,	citizens [3] - 44:24,	115:3, 115:7,	commitment [2] -
challenging [1] - 78:8	128:11, 128:14,	102:21, 102:22	115:11, 115:17	23:4, 23:7
chance [2] - 165:18,	142:9, 143:17	City [3] - 204:1,	clips [13] - 108:5,	common [4] - 26:5,
193:10	channels [3] - 30:1,	211:23, 212:5	108:13, 108:15,	147:1, 147:3, 148:5
	96:18, 130:20		109:25, 111:1,	commonly [1] -
chances [1] - 33:24	chapter [1] - 53:2	city [3] - 5:5, 43:13, 127:2	111:13, 112:7,	223:13
change [25] - 14:5,		Civil [2] - 219:23	112:10, 113:11,	communities [1] -
15:8, 24:17, 26:8,	characterizes [1] - 72:23		113:23, 114:7,	43:14
29:21, 31:15, 36:22,		claim [13] - 46:18,	114:19, 115:25	
42:11, 62:17, 63:9,	charge [2] - 86:24, 181:13	51:14, 61:16, 67:7,	close [7] - 29:9, 43:4,	community [1] - 43:18
66:17, 71:25, 89:14,		73:12, 74:17, 78:23,	85:20, 144:2,	Compact [3] - 8:2,
91:14, 97:13, 98:22,	charged [2] - 53:12,	103:8, 154:23,	176:20, 194:23,	181:16, 205:23
102:11, 121:19,	73:11	174:11, 203:24,	237:2	compare [2] - 15:4,
123:10, 156:10,	chart [36] - 9:17, 9:23,	208:9, 210:25	closed [1] - 26:22	49:6
181:2, 188:4, 188:5,	10:1, 10:24, 11:9,	claimed [5] - 51:11,	closed [1] - 201:10	compared [3] - 49:21,
227:23, 236:23	13:12, 14:19, 19:4,	62:11, 71:21, 94:10,	closely [1] - 201:10 closure [1] - 60:24	75:7, 76:12
changed [10] - 13:20,	20:1, 21:17, 21:20,	154:21		compares [1] - 82:7
36:16, 37:1, 63:4,	22:8, 22:9, 22:13,	Claims [2] - 204:4,	co [3] - 55:6, 58:2, 110:20	comparing [1] -
67:12, 72:10,	24:4, 31:22, 32:7,	213:9		100:25
101:12, 191:16,	35:25, 48:19, 49:4,	claims [12] - 51:12,	co-author [1] - 110:20	comparison [1] - 15:4
227:8, 227:11	49:10, 49:14, 65:6,	62:12, 67:2, 67:10,	co-authors [2] - 55:6,	compartmentalize [1]
changes [24] - 29:14,	75:9, 75:22, 76:1,	71:11, 81:11, 83:14,	58:2	- 198:21
63:6, 63:19, 63:23,	80:5, 82:6, 82:12,	103:1, 203:14,	coast [1] - 112:17	compel [1] - 92:20
68:19, 72:20, 73:2, 09:44, 09:00, 409:0	100:19, 101:1,	207:14, 213:11,	cold [2] - 223:7, 223:8	compelling [1] - 58:12
92:14, 98:20, 102:8,	121:19, 122:14,	213:24	collapse [13] - 53:1,	compile [1] - 64:23
127:17, 131:24,	123:2, 130:22, 133:3	clarification [2] -	53:8, 53:14, 53:24,	Complaint [1] -
227:13, 231:10,	charts [2] - 21:5, 91:5	209:14, 224:12	54:20, 54:22, 54:24,	154:14
231:25, 232:6,	Chattahoochee [18] -	clarify [4] - 56:12,	55:25, 56:9, 58:9,	complaint [7] - 53:3,
232:7, 233:25,	8:10, 12:16, 12:18, 12:23, 47:14, 89:4,	147:8, 219:5, 224:7	58:24, 59:13, 60:16	55:24, 56:6, 79:4,
234:4, 234:14, 234:23, 235:4,	121:20, 121:23,	clarifying [1] - 189:18	colleague [3] - 57:6,	154:21, 155:9,
234.23, 235.4, 235:24	121:20, 121:23, 122:8, 126:18,	Claudette [4] - 1:14,	57:16, 179:19	155:25
changing [7] - 23:25,	134:20, 136:7,	238:2, 238:15,	colleagues [2] - 6:2,	complete [1] - 79:19
36:15, 66:12, 95:3,	172:19, 174:21,	238:15	193:9 Colorado (%) 45:15	completely [2] -
101:13, 227:24	187:10, 202:3,	Clean [1] - 22:3	Colorado [2] - 45:15,	102:1, 161:15
Channel [4] - 127:12,	211:4, 218:24	clear [19] - 12:7,	45:21	compliance [3] -
127:14, 127:20,	cheap [1] - 82:16	36:20, 44:20, 45:13,	Columbus [2] -	21:22, 21:24, 180:20
127.14, 127.20, 128:18	check [3] - 107:2,	45:16, 50:22, 51:7,	218:17, 219:3	component [1] - 231:5
channel [46] - 30:5,	151:14, 193:9	51:13, 55:16, 56:15,	column [3] - 20:12,	composition [1] -
,		71:18, 74:20, 92:22,	20:14, 21:11	140:4
30:22, 31:2, 63:7, 65:3, 65:12, 65:21,	Chesapeake [1] - 59:10	102:18, 164:25,	combine [1] - 108:17	compounds [1] -
65:23, 66:5, 66:16,	chief [1] - 182:25	166:2, 186:22, 200:10, 212:21	combined [4] - 82:8,	15:25
72:20, 123:15,	Chipola [12] - 67:18,	200:19, 212:21 clearly [3] - 76:1, 76:4,	198:14, 198:20, 202:10	Comprehensive [2] -
124:4, 124:8,	68:14, 68:17, 70:5,	183:5	203:10	181:15, 205:23
124:23, 125:7,	177:12, 177:14,		coming [9] - 24:6,	conceded [1] - 68:9
124.23, 125.7, 125.1	177:12, 177:14, 177:16, 177:20,	CLERK [4] - 105:1,	52:11, 91:3, 121:5,	concentrated [1] -
128:7, 128:9,	177:10, 177:20, 177:20, 177:23, 195:2,	105:8, 116:11, 116:18	144:9, 230:23,	60:5
128:13, 130:25,	220:21, 234:25		234:8, 234:10, 236:6	concept [1] - 224:17
132:2, 133:8,	Chris [1] - 4:7	climatic [1] - 16:1	commencing [1] -	concern [3] - 59:17,
133:11, 137:13,	CHRISTOPHER [1] -	climatologic [1] -	1:13	165:5, 230:15
138:14, 139:9,	1:19	36:17	commend [1] - 103:25	concerned [2] - 8:12,
141:16, 163:1,	circles [1] - 11:5	climb [2] - 235:19,	comments [1] - 42:6	225:19
164:7, 173:10,		235:22	Commerce [1] - 60:21	concerning [4] -
181:2, 188:7, 188:8,	circulation [1] - 189:23	clip [22] - 108:20,	commerce [2] -	84:25, 153:17,
189:2, 189:4,	cite [2] - 224:16, 225:3	109:1, 109:3, 109:7, 100:21, 110:12	218:19, 219:11	207:14, 208:9
189:17, 189:19,	cited [2] - 224:16, 225:3 cited [5] - 166:19,	109:21, 110:12,	Commission [10] -	concerns [4] - 86:1,
189:20, 195:1,		110:18, 111:7,	54:7. 57:7, 64:18,	151:12, 151:18,
	171:15, 172:12, TH	E REPORTING G	NUUE 3, 119:3,	152:12
	M	lason & Lockha	irt	
	1	·	-	66 of 93 she

conch [3] - 25:9,	consequence [1] -	67:3, 68:6, 73:19,	182:5, 184:8,	143:6, 144:11,
25:11, 26:7	66:7	75:19, 76:9, 79:24,	184:11, 190:16,	154:5, 154:15,
conchs [4] - 25:2,	consequences [4] -	80:1, 80:2, 81:12,	190:20, 190:21,	154:21, 155:10,
26:7, 26:20, 27:7	44:23, 45:18, 85:14,	81:17, 81:22, 82:22,	190:24, 191:1	155:11, 155:21,
conclude [1] - 88:10	102:21	96:23, 100:6,	controls [5] - 40:8,	160:24, 161:1,
concluded [5] - 58:5,	Conservancy [1] -	103:16, 112:17	167:15, 167:21,	161:10, 162:24,
65:13, 72:22, 83:8,	134:15	consumptions [1] -	168:18, 172:18	164:17, 165:4,
211:2	conservation [8] -	81:14	convened [1] - 37:25	165:5, 165:10,
concludes [2] - 28:21,	78:16, 78:20, 79:9,	Consumptive [1] -	converted [1] - 137:23	165:21, 166:1,
29:1	79:11, 79:12, 80:16,	110:22	convey [1] - 70:7	166:20, 166:25,
concluding [1] - 196:9	81:4, 84:18	consumptive [12] -	convincing [10] - 12:7,	167:6, 167:11,
conclusion [6] -	Conservation [5] -	52:3, 76:11, 80:11,	45:14, 45:17, 50:22,	167:14, 167:15,
29:19, 40:25, 58:23,	54:5, 64:17, 114:1,	82:25, 94:21, 99:16,	51:8, 51:14, 55:17,	167:17, 167:21,
102:15, 115:25,	117:3, 182:3	100:10, 100:21,	71:18, 74:20, 102:19	168:13, 168:18,
149:10	conservative [4] -	101:3, 101:9, 110:1,	cool [1] - 233:18	169:3, 169:13,
conclusions [3] -	98:4, 98:9, 98:13,	231:8	cooperate [1] - 7:13	171:17, 172:18,
26:25, 54:14, 69:15	98:17	contain [1] - 203:2	cooperatively [1] -	173:15, 174:16,
condition [1] - 60:1	conserve [2] - 23:13,	contained [2] - 65:22,	135:8	177:14, 180:14,
conditions [7] - 66:13,	43:7	156:4	coordinate [1] - 119:3	180:16, 199:13,
76:16, 80:22,	conserved [2] - 88:24,	containing [1] - 214:7	coordinated [1] -	199:21, 203:8,
142:14, 172:21,	89:2	contains [1] - 178:3	160:5	203:14, 206:24,
222:15	consider [3] - 127:1,	contemplates [1] -	coordinating [2] -	208:9, 208:14,
Conditions [1] - 185:5	148:1, 181:4	98:11	159:19, 199:1	208:15, 208:16,
conduct [4] - 45:10,	considerable [1] -	contemporaneous [1]	coordination [1] -	208:23, 209:17,
62:18, 133:14,	19:11	- 55:18	152:13	209:21, 209:24,
133:20	considered [3] - 39:9,	contents [1] - 112:11	copied [3] - 180:13,	210:4, 210:25,
conducted [8] - 74:22,	93:2, 145:18	context [3] - 8:2,	211:13, 212:1	213:24, 214:9,
85:9, 93:13, 115:13,	considering [1] -	48:23, 141:2	copies [2] - 57:24,	216:1, 216:13,
182:9, 185:8,	69:25	contiguous [1] - 60:25	119:20	216:21, 217:14,
200:21, 201:17	considers [1] - 90:13	continuation [1] -	copy [7] - 105:18,	218:11, 218:15,
conducting [1] -	consistent [1] - 96:7	155:24	117:23, 122:22,	228:17, 231:3,
183:13	consistently [2] -	continue [3] - 10:11,	125:22, 132:14,	231:5, 232:13, 235:4
confess [1] - 32:25	20:22, 93:22	50:4, 81:13	153:14, 204:15	Corps' [7] - 73:2,
confident [1] - 60:14	Constitution [3] -	continued [6] - 73:4,	Corley [2] - 221:12,	160:10, 160:16,
confirm [5] - 59:12,	23:12, 43:6, 45:10	155:12, 173:22,	221:19	172:5, 199:19,
158:24, 191:24,	constrained [1] -	201:10, 203:9,	corn [1] - 48:15	206:3, 214:16
194:4, 217:13	35:13	232:25	corner [1] - 48:13	Corps's [2] - 93:18,
confirms [1] - 62:6	constructed [2] -	continues [5] - 37:19,	Corps [128] - 8:15,	156:9
confused [2] - 81:25,	122:24, 123:10	114:11, 195:25,	50:7, 64:1, 72:20,	correct [402] - 118:9,
213:16	construction [5] -	196:14, 196:23	73:9, 76:19, 77:4,	118:10, 118:13,
confusing [1] - 12:17	63:2, 63:24, 72:9,	continuing [1] -	77:6, 78:3, 81:17,	118:14, 119:1,
Congress [2] - 1:12,	226:22, 226:23	232:15	83:5, 83:8, 88:5,	120:5, 120:9,
128:6	consultant [1] - 181:7	continuous [1] - 60:3	88:7, 88:10, 88:14,	120:12, 120:18,
conjunction [1] -	consultation [1] - 83:7	contradict [1] - 71:3	88:18, 88:22, 88:23,	120:20, 120:21,
175:2	consulted [1] - 93:15	contribute [2] -	88:25, 89:2, 89:9,	120:24, 120:25,
connect [6] - 96:18,	consulting [1] -	167:18, 230:20	89:14, 89:19, 89:25,	121:2, 121:8, 121:9,
187:18, 188:2,	200:10	contributed [1] -	90:20, 91:1, 91:8,	121:18, 121:21,
190:14, 191:5,	consume [3] - 12:3,	28:14	91:9, 91:18, 91:22,	121:22, 122:1,
234:18	77:15, 232:8	contributing [2] -	92:1, 92:5, 92:11,	122:10, 122:15,
connected [4] - 183:5,	consumed [2] - 82:13,	161:3, 195:4	92:14, 92:18, 92:19,	122:16, 122:19,
206:14, 209:12,	230:21	contribution [1] -	92:20, 92:23, 92:25,	122:20, 123:4,
211:5	Consumer [1] - 25:19	77:16	93:2, 93:10, 93:12,	123:5, 123:8, 123:9,
connection [11] -	consumes [5] - 49:8,	contributions [2] -	93:15, 93:20, 93:22,	123:17, 123:19,
53:23, 54:14, 54:19,	49:16, 49:21, 75:7,	77:19, 77:23	96:10, 103:14,	123:20, 123:25,
56:4, 58:18, 97:12,	49.16, 49.21, 75.7, 76:21	contributor [1] - 60:16	118:25, 119:9,	124:6, 124:7,
186:22, 186:25,	consumption [28] -	Control [2] - 73:3,	119:13, 128:12,	124:14, 124:20,
207:13, 208:9, 211:8	9:19, 9:22, 9:25,	146:15	129:21, 130:7,	124:21, 124:24,
connectivity [3] -	9.19, 9.22, 9.25, 10:2, 10:8, 37:1,	control [2] - 45:10,	130:9, 130:15,	124:25, 125:8,
124:20, 138:2,	41:12, 41:15, 46:11	167:23	131:4, 133:14,	125:9, 125:15,
139:18	49:12, 51:19, 63 THE		ROUP 5, 138:11,	126:7, 126:8,
	10.12, 01.10, 00		I .	126:12, 126:13,

67 of 93 sheets

126:19, 126:20,	160:9, 160:12,	194:19, 195:6,	3:11, 3:24, 5:15,	101:8, 102:9,
126:24, 126:25,	160:19, 160:20,	195:8, 195:9,	6:19, 43:22, 103:25,	102:11, 102:17,
127:10, 127:11,	160:22, 161:4,	195:15, 195:19,	106:22, 129:15,	103:4, 103:6,
127:20, 127:21,	161:5, 161:16,	196:11, 196:16,	140:18, 147:9,	103:18, 105:12,
128:4, 128:15,	161:17, 161:22,	196:24, 197:2,	156:16, 169:21,	107:9, 107:21,
128:19, 128:20,	161:23, 161:25,	197:8, 198:6, 198:7,	192:14, 192:15,	117:22, 119:21,
129:22, 129:23,	162:1, 162:5,	199:4, 199:5, 199:9,	193:3, 218:10,	126:17, 160:24,
130:1, 130:22,	162:10, 162:18,	199:14, 199:15,	225:21, 226:6,	175:21, 175:24,
130:23, 131:6,	162:20, 163:3,	199:17, 200:1,	226:25, 229:2, 237:7	192:10, 198:5,
131:7, 131:21,	163:11, 163:12,	200:8, 200:9,	counsel's [1] - 3:11	214:22, 216:12,
132:2, 132:11,	164:19, 165:7,	200:12, 200:22,	count [2] - 221:17,	217:6, 238:16
133:1, 133:8, 133:9,	165:13, 166:3,	201:7, 201:8,	222:4	Court's [5] - 4:10,
133:12, 133:14,	166:4, 166:12,	201:12, 201:13,	counting [1] - 152:8	21:1, 49:3, 74:18,
133:19, 133:23,	166:17, 166:18,	201:19, 201:20,	country [1] - 79:12	88:17
133:25, 134:1,	166:21, 166:22,	202:1, 202:4, 202:8,	couple [9] - 4:11,	courtroom [2] - 25:25,
134:4, 134:6,	166:25, 167:1,	202:9, 202:11,	14:3, 30:10, 95:14,	84:14
135:18, 135:19,	167:7, 167:8,	202:13, 202:18,	144:10, 164:22,	courts [1] - 96:9
135:24, 136:3,	167:12, 167:13,	202:19, 202:25,	194:10, 195:7, 230:5	CRAIG [1] - 1:21
136:4, 136:6,	169:15, 170:13,	203:5, 203:14,	course [8] - 8:21,	Craig [2] - 5:24, 43:24
136:14, 136:19,	170:21, 171:1,	205:2, 205:18,	10:9, 24:3, 26:18,	crash [2] - 27:4, 28:9
137:11, 137:13,	171:11, 171:21,	205:19, 205:21,	28:17, 29:23, 33:11,	crashed [1] - 27:18
137:14, 137:19,	171:24, 172:2,	205:22, 206:11,	34:8	create [1] - 34:2
137:24, 137:25,	172:10, 173:1,	206:20, 206:25,	COURT [1] - 1:1	created [9] - 15:19,
138:2, 138:3, 138:8,	173:18, 174:9,	207:7, 208:3, 208:4,	court [38] - 6:3, 8:13,	41:25, 65:10, 86:9,
138:24, 138:25,	174:10, 174:12,	208:6, 208:11,	33:25, 68:12, 92:20,	90:11, 90:21, 101:1,
139:3, 139:4,	174:13, 174:22,	208:22, 208:24,	96:14, 96:25,	113:12, 185:15
139:10, 139:11,	175:6, 175:12,	209:3, 209:22,	106:23, 155:10,	creating [2] - 120:11,
139:19, 139:20,	175:13, 175:17,	209:23, 210:6,	157:10, 159:17,	228:18
139:23, 140:1,	175:22, 176:5,	210:15, 211:7,	160:15, 160:21,	
140:2, 140:5, 140:6,	176:14, 176:15,	211:10, 211:14,	161:7, 161:14,	creatures [1] - 71:16
140:9, 140:10,	176:19, 177:5,	211:15, 211:18,	163:22, 165:3,	credit [1] - 151:23
140:13, 140:14,	177:7, 177:10,	212:7, 212:8,		Creek [3] - 10:23,
141:12, 141:17,	177:12, 177:13,	212:14, 212:18,	165:21, 172:4,	14:11, 136:9
141:18, 141:22,	177:17, 178:4,	212:24, 213:12,	173:3, 174:15,	criteria [4] - 19:7,
142:3, 142:9,	178:17, 178:18,	214:2, 214:12,	175:1, 176:23,	22:2, 87:13, 87:16
143:18, 144:14,	178:25, 179:4,	214:15, 214:19,	182:15, 203:9,	critical [5] - 43:15,
144:19, 145:5,	179:20, 180:1,	214:25, 215:24,	203:16, 203:20,	47:1, 73:6, 155:15,
			206:3, 207:11,	165:23
145:6, 145:8, 145:9,	180:4, 180:7, 180:8,	216:23, 217:10, 217:11, 217:18,	207:12, 208:3,	criticize [1] - 81:3
145:13, 145:18,	180:11, 180:12,	, ,	209:15, 209:21,	criticizing [1] - 75:1
145:24, 145:25,	180:15, 180:17,	217:19, 219:9,	211:12, 211:19,	crop [2] - 17:14, 102:1
146:1, 146:8,	180:18, 181:3,	219:12, 221:25,	216:20, 217:14,	crops [2] - 48:15,
146:16, 147:5,	181:8, 182:8,	222:7, 222:8,	217:18	50:16
147:15, 147:17,	182:13, 182:17,	222:20, 222:24,	Court [76] - 1:12, 8:20,	cross [4] - 106:4,
147:18, 147:21,	183:2, 183:4, 183:7,	226:8, 226:19,	44:14, 45:2, 45:7,	106:7, 116:7, 117:22
147:22, 148:3,	183:8, 183:12,	226:20, 227:2,	45:8, 45:16, 45:20,	CROSS [1] - 118:6
148:6, 148:15,	184:6, 184:10,	227:3, 227:7, 227:9,	45:21, 46:2, 46:9,	Cross [1] - 2:2
149:17, 149:22,	184:22, 185:1,	227:10, 228:24,	46:15, 46:22, 47:3,	cross-examination [2]
149:23, 149:25,	185:7, 185:9,	229:4, 232:2, 238:4	48:1, 50:10, 50:17,	- 106:4, 106:7
150:4, 150:8,	185:10, 185:13,	correctly [4] - 151:19,	50:20, 55:4, 56:23,	CROSS-
150:14, 150:23,	185:21, 185:23,	207:19, 214:24,	56:25, 57:12, 58:11,	
150:24, 151:1,	185:24, 186:4,	219:10	58:14, 58:16, 59:19,	EXAMINATION [1] -
151:6, 152:2, 152:3,	186:5, 186:7,	correlation [1] - 91:6	59:21, 61:21, 64:14,	118:6
152:4, 152:5, 152:8,	186:11, 186:13,	correlations [1] - 55:7	67:16, 69:6, 71:6,	cross-examining [1] -
152:9, 153:4, 153:8,	186:20, 187:11,	corrosive [1] - 64:4	74:10, 80:5, 81:25,	116:7
153:19, 153:20,	187:12, 187:15,	cost [5] - 101:14,	82:5, 82:11, 87:15,	crossing [1] - 10:16
154:5, 154:8,	187:16, 187:24,	101:16, 101:20,	87:16, 88:9, 88:11,	CRR [2] - 1:14, 238:15
155:23, 156:6,	187:25, 188:10,	102:2, 102:5	94:17, 94:22, 94:25,	crush [1] - 99:6
157:18, 158:7,	188:11, 188:12,	Couch [2] - 86:4, 86:5	95:2, 98:1, 98:17,	cubic [6] - 13:17,
159:3, 159:4,	188:20, 189:16,	Couch's [1] - 86:13	98:24, 99:5, 99:9,	16:22, 19:9, 143:25,
159:22, 159:23,	194:11. 194:14.			144:3, 187:10
159:25, 160:8,	194:16, 194:17, ^{THI}	E REPORTING G	KUUP , 00.20, 100.1,	culprit [1] - 28:3
		∎ lason & Lockha	rt	
	IV.	LUCKIIA		68 of 93 shee

cured [1] - 142:19	136:15, 137:12,	decision [1] - 61:9	definition [3] - 145:10,	168:3, 168:10
current [7] - 35:10,	137:22, 139:18,	decisions [2] - 45:23,	186:22, 196:8	depositions [1] -
35:12, 69:17,	140:3	74:18	degraded [1] - 135:21	40:22
134:21, 148:13,	Damage [7] - 120:15,	deck [3] - 127:4,	degree [1] - 172:19	depth [3] - 124:6,
224:24, 236:9	121:13, 133:17,	136:2, 142:19	degrees [1] - 54:1	144:4, 211:9
cut [9] - 64:2, 91:16,	137:9, 139:25,		-	depths [1] - 184:3
•• •		Declaration [2] -	deliver [4] - 50:6,	
97:11, 97:23, 99:19,	226:1, 226:4	27:17, 158:5	76:20, 92:1, 92:9	DeSantis [3] - 1:22,
124:4, 164:5,	damaged [2] - 124:9,	declaration [45] -	demands [1] - 50:20	6:11, 6:12
177:15, 213:21	124:15	157:23, 158:24,	demise [1] - 71:17	describe [5] - 11:14,
cutoff [8] - 177:12,	damaging [2] - 61:2,	159:6, 163:9,	demonstrate [2] -	13:8, 39:19, 84:15,
177:14, 177:20,	126:9	164:13, 164:21,	89:11, 103:7	108:3
177:23, 195:3,	dams [8] - 134:3,	165:14, 166:5,	demonstrates [1] -	describes [1] - 25:20
220:21, 223:13,	161:2, 166:9,	168:11, 168:24,	19:4	describing [3] - 108:7,
223:18	166:13, 174:21,	168:25, 170:12,	demonstrating [1] -	126:10, 162:11
cutoffs [1] - 223:10	199:22, 207:13,	170:20, 171:8,	88:13	desert [1] - 225:4
cuts [5] - 90:4, 97:5,	214:17	171:11, 171:15,	demonstrative [2] -	designated [8] - 73:6,
97:15, 99:10, 102:4	data [16] - 8:7, 12:13,	171:22, 172:12,	12:14, 12:21	130:2, 130:9,
cutting [16] - 102:22,	14:22, 17:25, 24:5,	173:18, 191:21,	demonstratives [1] -	131:15, 165:23,
123:15, 124:8,	28:24, 31:22, 65:10,	191:24, 193:16,	7:6	176:5, 224:14,
124:23, 125:7,	73:21, 75:15, 76:23,	197:9, 197:17,		228:15
137:13, 162:22,	77:15, 85:1, 85:12,	197:20, 198:13,	denied [3] - 142:22,	
226:7, 226:9,	86:1, 91:4	197.20, 198.13, 198:23, 198:25,	222:9, 222:18	designations [7] -
226:1, 226:9, 226:11, 226:21,	date [2] - 32:3, 85:23	200:4, 201:15,	densities [2] - 69:16,	7:10, 7:12, 7:14,
		202:20, 203:1,	148:12	18:9, 28:5, 33:18,
227:5, 227:12,	dated [5] - 105:24,		density [1] - 214:7	108:17
227:21, 228:4	117:12, 134:11,	203:7, 203:17,	denying [1] - 88:16	designed [2] - 86:11,
cycle [1] - 145:12	143:13, 181:24	204:21, 205:9,	department [1] - 57:4	223:20
Cyphers [1] - 5:11	dates [1] - 85:23	205:16, 205:24,	Department [10] -	designs [1] - 128:11
CYPHERS [1] - 5:12	dating [1] - 32:13	206:22, 207:10,	4:16, 5:16, 25:18,	destroy [1] - 73:5
cypress [2] - 31:19,	David [1] - 67:8	207:23, 208:2,	54:4, 60:20, 64:19,	destroying [1] -
32:5	days [8] - 22:15,	208:17, 209:19,	104:24, 108:1,	155:15
	30:10, 33:11, 99:2,	209:20	115:13, 166:11	Destruction [3] -
D	99:4, 99:7, 182:14,	declarations [1] -	dependable [2] - 50:5,	127:12, 127:19,
				127.12, 127.10,
	183:7	208:25	-	128:17
dam [30] - 63:3, 64:2,	- 183:7 dead [9] - 30:19,	208:25 decline [5] - 10:18,	92:9	128:17
72:12, 73:8, 120:22,	dead [9] - 30:19,		92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18,	128:17 destruction [3] -
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24,	decline [5] - 10:18,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12,	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] -
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6,	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15,	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20,	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7 decreases [3] - 79:25,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] -	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20, 152:18, 198:9	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7 decreases [3] - 79:25, 80:3, 226:15	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20, 152:18, 198:9 deals [3] - 113:23,	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7 decreases [3] - 79:25, 80:3, 226:15 decreasing [2] - 68:1,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] -	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20, 152:18, 198:9 deals [3] - 113:23, 114:7, 115:12	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7 decreases [3] - 79:25, 80:3, 226:15 decreasing [2] - 68:1, 229:23	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20, 152:18, 198:9 deals [3] - 113:23, 114:7, 115:12 dealt [1] - 156:9	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7 decreases [3] - 79:25, 80:3, 226:15 decreasing [2] - 68:1, 229:23 dedicated [2] - 44:18,	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20, 152:18, 198:9 deals [3] - 113:23, 114:7, 115:12 dealt [1] - 156:9 dear [1] - 182:1	decline [5] - 10:18, 65:8, 66:16, 76:18, 123:6 declined [5] - 39:23, 60:2, 65:1, 66:10, 80:13 declines [4] - 16:9, 65:5, 140:4, 147:25 decreased [1] - 66:7 decreases [3] - 79:25, 80:3, 226:15 decreasing [2] - 68:1, 229:23 dedicated [2] - 44:18, 84:10	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25,	dead [9] - 30:19, 31:14, 166:24, 167:4, 168:12, 178:15, 183:6, 187:22, 217:1 deal [3] - 37:15, 111:13, 223:4 Deal [1] - 6:20 dealer [1] - 26:2 dealing [3] - 102:20, 152:18, 198:9 deals [3] - 113:23, 114:7, 115:12 dealt [1] - 156:9	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline} [5] - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined} [5] - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines} [4] - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased} [1] - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases} [3] - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing} [2] - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated} [2] - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep} [4] - 83:15,\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing [3] -	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9 devastating [2] -
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19, \\ 31:14, \ 166:24, \\ 167:4, \ 168:12, \\ 178:15, \ 183:6, \\ 187:22, \ 217:1 \\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15, \\ 111:13, \ 223:4 \\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20 \\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2 \\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20, \\ 152:18, \ 198:9 \\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23, \\ 114:7, \ 115:12 \\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9 \\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing [3] - 144:18, 193:19,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9 devastating [2] - 45:19, 102:23
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19, \\ 31:14, \ 166:24, \\ 167:4, \ 168:12, \\ 178:15, \ 183:6, \\ 187:22, \ 217:1 \\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15, \\ 111:13, \ 223:4 \\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20 \\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 6:20 \\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2 \\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20, \\ 152:18, \ 198:9 \\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23, \\ 114:7, \ 115:12 \\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9 \\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1 \\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19, \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing [3] - 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition [26] - 18:9,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9 devastating [2] - 45:19, 102:23 develop [2] - 85:12,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, \ 166:24,\\ 167:4, \ 168:12,\\ 178:15, \ 183:6,\\ 187:22, \ 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, \ 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, \ 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, \ 115:12\\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatr} \ [1] - 182:1\\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing [3] - 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition [26] - 18:9, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9 devastating [2] - 45:19, 102:23 develop [2] - 85:12, 86:8 developed [8] - 8:7,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19, \\ 31:14, 166:24, \\ 167:4, 168:12, \\ 178:15, 183:6, \\ 187:22, 217:1 \\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15, \\ 111:13, 223:4 \\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20 \\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2 \\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20, \\ 152:18, 198:9 \\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23, \\ 114:7, 115:12 \\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9 \\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1 \\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19, \\ 145:11 \\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction [2] - 12:22, 17:12 depicts [2] - 30:19, 229:7 deplete [1] - 33:25 depletions [1] - 33:10 deposited [6] - 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing [3] - 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition [26] - 18:9, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9 devastating [2] - 45:19, 102:23 develop [2] - 85:12, 86:8 developed [8] - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19, \\ 31:14, 166:24, \\ 167:4, 168:12, \\ 178:15, 183:6, \\ 187:22, 217:1 \\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15, \\ 111:13, 223:4 \\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20 \\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2 \\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20, \\ 152:18, 198:9 \\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23, \\ 114:7, 115:12 \\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9 \\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1 \\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19, \\ 145:11 \\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8 \\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15, \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23,	128:17 destruction [3] - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive [2] - 130:20, 173:10 detail [5] - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details [1] - 94:23 determine [3] - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined [2] - 18:1, 40:16 detritus [1] - 196:9 devastating [2] - 45:19, 102:23 develop [2] - 85:12, 86:8 developed [8] - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, \ 166:24,\\ 167:4, \ 168:12,\\ 178:15, \ 183:6,\\ 187:22, \ 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, \ 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, \ 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, \ 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, \ 115:12\\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatt} \ [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8\\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15,\\ 70:13, \ 70:21, \ 236:24\\ \textbf{decades} \ [1] - 18:11\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{deeper}{[4]} - 39:6,\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develop $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12,
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6, 174:18, 199:23,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, \ 166:24,\\ 167:4, \ 168:12,\\ 178:15, \ 183:6,\\ 187:22, \ 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, \ 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, \ 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, \ 115:12\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, \ 115:12\\ \textbf{death} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatn} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatn} \ [1] - 182:1\\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8\\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15,\\ 70:13, \ 70:21, \ 236:24\\ \textbf{decades} \ [1] - 18:11\\ \textbf{December} \ [4] - 57:2,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]}-10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]}-39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]}-16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]}-66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]}-79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]}-68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]}-44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]}-83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]}-65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{decper}{[4]}-39:6,\\ 128:15, 133:11,\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22, 106:18, 106:19,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develope $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12, 130:7
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6, 174:18, 199:23, 226:19	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, \ 166:24,\\ 167:4, \ 168:12,\\ 178:15, \ 183:6,\\ 187:22, \ 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, \ 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, \ 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, \ 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, \ 115:12\\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deatt} \ [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8\\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15,\\ 70:13, \ 70:21, \ 236:24\\ \textbf{decades} \ [1] - 18:11\\ \textbf{December} \ [4] - 57:2,\\ 204:7, \ 204:13,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{deeper}{[4]} - 39:6,\\ 128:15, 133:11,\\ 141:16\\ \textbf{deep}{[1]} - 102:8\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22, 106:18, 106:19, 107:24, 127:18,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develop $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12, 130:7 developing $[2]$ -
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6, 174:18, 199:23, 226:19 damage [12] - 46:11,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, 166:24,\\ 167:4, 168:12,\\ 178:15, 183:6,\\ 187:22, 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, 115:12\\ \textbf{dealt} [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deat} [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{deat} [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \textbf{debris} [1] - 139:8\\ \textbf{decade} [4] - 32:15,\\ 70:13, 70:21, 236:24\\ \textbf{decades} [1] - 18:11\\ \textbf{December} [4] - 57:2,\\ 204:7, 204:13,\\ 210:14\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{deeper}{[4]} - 39:6,\\ 128:15, 133:11,\\ 141:16\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 102:8\\ \textbf{defend}{[3]} - 47:8, 78:6\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22, 106:18, 106:19, 107:24, 127:18, 132:8, 132:10,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develop $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12, 130:7 developing $[2]$ - 97:10, 151:10
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6, 174:18, 199:23, 226:19 damage [12] - 46:11, 123:14, 124:12,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, 166:24,\\ 167:4, 168:12,\\ 178:15, 183:6,\\ 187:22, 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, 115:12\\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1\\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8\\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15,\\ 70:13, 70:21, 236:24\\ \textbf{decades} \ [1] - 18:11\\ \textbf{December} \ [4] - 57:2,\\ 204:7, 204:13,\\ 210:14\\ \textbf{decide} \ [1] - 95:1\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{deeper}{[4]} - 39:6,\\ 128:15, 133:11,\\ 141:16\\ \textbf{deeply}{[1]} - 102:8\\ \textbf{defend}{[3]} - 47:8, 78:6\\ \textbf{defendant's}{[1]} - \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22, 106:18, 106:19, 107:24, 127:18, 132:8, 132:10, 150:21, 151:6,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develop $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12, 130:7 developing $[2]$ - 97:10, 151:10 development $[1]$ -
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6, 174:18, 199:23, 226:19 damage [12] - 46:11, 123:14, 124:12, 125:13, 133:20,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19, \\ 31:14, 166:24, \\ 167:4, 168:12, \\ 178:15, 183:6, \\ 187:22, 217:1 \\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15, \\ 111:13, 223:4 \\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20 \\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2 \\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20, \\ 152:18, 198:9 \\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23, \\ 114:7, 115:12 \\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23, \\ 114:7, 115:12 \\ \textbf{death} \ [1] - 156:9 \\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1 \\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19, \\ 145:11 \\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8 \\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15, \\ 70:13, 70:21, 236:24 \\ \textbf{decades} \ [1] - 18:11 \\ \textbf{December} \ [4] - 57:2, \\ 204:7, 204:13, \\ 210:14 \\ \textbf{decide} \ [1] - 95:1 \\ \textbf{decided} \ [2] - 66:25. \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{deeper}{[4]} - 39:6,\\ 128:15, 133:11,\\ 141:16\\ \textbf{deeply}{[1]} - 102:8\\ \textbf{defend}{[3]} - 47:8, 78:6\\ \textbf{defendant's}{[1]} -\\ 172:24\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22, 106:18, 106:19, 107:24, 127:18, 132:8, 132:10, 150:21, 151:6, 153:3, 163:5,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develop $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12, 130:7 developing $[2]$ - 97:10, 151:10 development $[1]$ - 23:21
72:12, 73:8, 120:22, 121:6, 122:3, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 125:8, 134:24, 135:11, 135:14, 135:17, 135:20, 136:13, 136:14, 136:16, 136:17, 142:9, 161:22, 162:3, 162:6, 167:17, 173:9, 208:8, 226:14, 226:22, 226:24 Dam [17] - 63:25, 66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 161:25, 162:22, 164:6, 174:18, 199:23, 226:19 damage [12] - 46:11, 123:14, 124:12,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{dead} \ [9] - 30:19,\\ 31:14, 166:24,\\ 167:4, 168:12,\\ 178:15, 183:6,\\ 187:22, 217:1\\ \textbf{deal} \ [3] - 37:15,\\ 111:13, 223:4\\ \textbf{Deal} \ [1] - 6:20\\ \textbf{dealer} \ [1] - 26:2\\ \textbf{dealing} \ [3] - 102:20,\\ 152:18, 198:9\\ \textbf{deals} \ [3] - 113:23,\\ 114:7, 115:12\\ \textbf{dealt} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 156:9\\ \textbf{dear} \ [1] - 182:1\\ \textbf{death} \ [2] - 70:19,\\ 145:11\\ \textbf{debris} \ [1] - 139:8\\ \textbf{decade} \ [4] - 32:15,\\ 70:13, 70:21, 236:24\\ \textbf{decades} \ [1] - 18:11\\ \textbf{December} \ [4] - 57:2,\\ 204:7, 204:13,\\ 210:14\\ \textbf{decide} \ [1] - 95:1\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{decline}{[5]} - 10:18,\\ 65:8, 66:16, 76:18,\\ 123:6\\ \textbf{declined}{[5]} - 39:23,\\ 60:2, 65:1, 66:10,\\ 80:13\\ \textbf{declines}{[4]} - 16:9,\\ 65:5, 140:4, 147:25\\ \textbf{decreased}{[1]} - 66:7\\ \textbf{decreases}{[3]} - 79:25,\\ 80:3, 226:15\\ \textbf{decreasing}{[2]} - 68:1,\\ 229:23\\ \textbf{dedicated}{[2]} - 44:18,\\ 84:10\\ \textbf{deep}{[4]} - 83:15,\\ 128:9, 144:5, 228:18\\ \textbf{deepening}{[2]} - 65:3,\\ 65:12\\ \textbf{deeper}{[4]} - 39:6,\\ 128:15, 133:11,\\ 141:16\\ \textbf{deeply}{[1]} - 102:8\\ \textbf{defend}{[3]} - 47:8, 78:6\\ \textbf{defendant's}{[1]} -\\ 172:24\\ \end{array}$	92:9 depicted $[5] - 17:18$, 18:6, 126:5, 139:21, 141:5 depiction $[2] - 12:22$, 17:12 depicts $[2] - 30:19$, 229:7 deplete $[1] - 33:25$ depletions $[1] - 33:10$ deposited $[6] -$ 144:12, 189:24, 190:11, 191:4, 191:18, 196:15 depositing $[3] -$ 144:18, 193:19, 196:9 deposition $[26] - 18:9$, 28:5, 33:18, 40:14, 40:16, 54:10, 56:2, 58:13, 68:11, 73:23, 99:22, 100:22, 106:18, 106:19, 107:24, 127:18, 132:8, 132:10, 150:21, 151:6,	128:17 destruction $[3]$ - 128:2, 130:24, 133:7 destructive $[2]$ - 130:20, 173:10 detail $[5]$ - 17:20, 23:18, 39:19, 40:2, 230:7 details $[1]$ - 94:23 determine $[3]$ - 67:9, 67:24, 184:19 determined $[2]$ - 18:1, 40:16 detritus $[1]$ - 196:9 devastating $[2]$ - 45:19, 102:23 develop $[2]$ - 85:12, 86:8 developed $[8]$ - 8:7, 33:15, 99:17, 123:22, 123:24, 128:10, 128:12, 130:7 developing $[2]$ - 97:10, 151:10 development $[1]$ -

69 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart —

r	T			
113:25	84:13, 87:23	211:19, 216:2, 216:4	166:11, 166:12,	227:21, 227:23,
Devora [1] - 6:4	dirt [1] - 64:8	disputed [1] - 22:22	170:7, 170:15,	228:3, 228:4,
DEVORA [1] - 1:21	disagree [3] - 149:13,	disrupt [1] - 72:13	181:5, 184:24,	229:22, 230:23,
devoted [1] - 51:2	190:3, 191:2	disrupted [1] - 63:7	193:17, 194:5,	234:9, 234:19,
			201:11, 207:5,	234:21, 236:6, 236:8
dewatered [6] -	disagrees [1] - 149:9	disrupting [1] - 46:3	208:5, 210:9,	down-cut [1] - 124:4
166:24, 167:6,	disappointing [1] -	disruption [2] -	210:10, 210:12,	
168:12, 178:24,	35:4	145:11, 192:5		down-cutting [14] -
179:1, 202:16	Disaster [1] - 27:16	dissolved [1] - 236:19	213:3, 219:14	123:15, 124:8,
dewaters [1] - 172:7	disastrous [2] - 169:2,	distribution [1] -	documented [1] -	124:23, 125:7,
die [2] - 200:11,	169:13	140:8	62:19	137:13, 226:7,
213:25	discharge [2] - 55:8,	District [13] - 5:11,	documents [19] -	226:9, 226:11,
die-off [2] - 200:11,	187:9	64:19, 96:12,	11:13, 11:20, 32:13,	226:21, 227:5,
213:25	discharges [1] - 184:4	154:17, 163:20,	32:15, 32:20, 32:25,	227:12, 227:21,
died [4] - 178:25,	Discharges [1] - 185:5	198:5, 203:17,	37:3, 37:21, 39:10,	228:4
201:25, 210:2,	disciplines [1] - 53:16	203:19, 205:18,	40:17, 41:9, 59:11,	downstream [7] -
212:12	disconnected [3] -	210:10, 213:4,	85:22, 107:7,	82:3, 82:19, 122:3,
difference [1] - 81:21	70:20, 184:20,	213:5, 216:11	107:10, 107:19,	125:2, 177:11,
differences [1] - 47:24	206:16	district [5] - 78:18,	107:22, 205:3	187:2, 206:16
different [13] - 8:14,	disconnection [8] -	79:10, 198:14,	dollar [1] - 223:17	Dr [104] - 9:20, 22:13,
8:22, 16:6, 20:5,	139:2, 140:12,	207:12, 208:3	dollars [3] - 47:20,	26:14, 28:11, 28:18,
28:14, 77:12, 84:3,	184:4, 186:13,	disturbance [1] -	48:14, 102:5	28:24, 29:13, 30:9,
97:11, 112:22,	186:15, 186:23,	189:23	done [29] - 9:13,	30:12, 30:16, 31:23,
126:6, 197:22,	187:8, 187:14	dive [1] - 201:6	28:18, 28:24, 29:20,	39:20, 41:4, 49:19,
198:3, 233:6	Disconnection [1] -	diver [1] - 201:5	39:1, 39:16, 40:4,	51:21, 52:7, 52:10,
	185:19		42:10, 56:3, 77:25,	54:7, 54:9, 54:23,
difficult [2] - 57:19, 70:6		diversion [2] - 46:5,	103:3, 103:18,	55:2, 55:5, 56:1,
	discovery [3] - 40:14,	195:2	133:15, 134:25,	56:20, 57:3, 58:5,
digging [1] - 131:5	77:24, 79:5	diversions [1] - 46:1	135:6, 137:16,	58:11, 58:22, 58:24,
digs [1] - 129:21	discrete [1] - 20:8	divided [1] - 86:10	140:21, 141:4,	59:3, 59:6, 59:10,
diminished [2] -	discretion [2] - 91:1,	diving [1] - 201:4	141:9, 149:7,	61:15, 61:23, 62:2,
65:14, 77:18	91:2	division [1] - 84:13	149:21, 184:18,	65:19, 67:8, 67:20,
dip [1] - 20:18	discuss [4] - 41:7,	Division [12] - 12:1,	200:16, 206:19,	68:9, 68:23, 69:5,
dipped [1] - 20:21	112:11, 144:23,	15:20, 18:11, 32:17,	207:2, 222:25,	71:2, 71:6, 71:11,
dire [3] - 71:1, 85:14,	192:17	33:17, 37:25, 38:11,	207.2, 222.23, 223:20, 223:20, 224:1, 235:5	71:22, 73:23, 75:24,
87:7	discussed [1] - 130:7	38:16, 84:12, 108:2,		81:5, 81:6, 82:23,
Direct [1] - 2:2	discussing [1] - 8:25	111:17, 115:15	doom [1] - 51:4	
DIRECT [2] - 105:21,	discussion [1] -	division's [1] - 22:6	dotted [1] - 122:13	86:5, 86:13, 89:7,
117:9	186:24	DNR [1] - 134:14	double [2] - 88:19,	89:11, 89:18, 89:22,
direct [25] - 9:20,	discussions [3] -	docket [3] - 158:18,	101:19	90:3, 90:8, 91:5,
22:12, 23:17, 30:12,	22:1, 95:16, 95:25	170:6, 208:5	double-edged [1] -	91:17, 94:11, 95:7,
70:9, 73:15, 101:18,	disease [2] - 26:12,	document [61] -	88:19	95:13, 95:15, 95:18,
105:19, 105:23,	27:7	11:24, 15:15, 15:18,	doubled [1] - 95:12	95:21, 96:5, 97:2,
117:7, 117:12,	disinterested [1] -	17:23, 33:14, 34:13,	doubt [2] - 37:14,	97:6, 97:10, 97:17,
119:21, 121:10,	238:8	34:16, 35:7, 36:9,	231:22	97:20, 98:2, 98:10,
125:4, 125:16,	dismissed [1] -	37:22, 38:25, 59:20,	Doug [1] - 96:11	99:1, 99:10, 99:19,
125:18, 126:1,	103:21	72:18, 107:16,	Dougherty [1] - 18:3	99:21, 100:1,
155:2, 161:11,	dispense [1] - 51:15	108:23, 109:3,	down [46] - 24:6, 31:8,	100:10, 100:15,
165:15, 175:11,	disposal [15] - 128:19,	112:15, 112:22,	49:1, 62:6, 101:7,	100:20, 100:22,
178:6, 178:23,	128:22, 129:12,	113:3, 113:8, 115:7,	106:10, 123:4,	101:1, 101:2, 101:5,
188:13, 216:25	129:20, 129:24,	115:18, 119:17,	123:15, 124:4,	101:11, 101:18,
direction [1] - 104:12	131:15, 131:20,	120:4, 120:8,	124:8, 124:23,	101:22, 102:7,
directly [5] - 92:19,	131:24, 132:5,	120:11, 120:14,	125:7, 137:13,	188:13, 188:18,
165:22, 200:25,	138:10, 143:2,	122:14, 144:25,	160:2, 171:7, 172:3,	189:6, 190:2, 190:5,
201:7, 212:18	143:4, 223:23,	147:16, 148:7,	200:14, 200:15,	191:3, 191:17,
Director [4] - 38:19,	224:3, 224:24	148:8, 148:19,	206:12, 207:8,	191:19, 195:17,
84:24, 86:4, 86:18	dispose [1] - 130:16	153:3, 154:16,	218:18, 220:15,	195:20
director [8] - 5:9,	disproportionately [1]	155:20, 156:5,	220:20, 221:11,	Dracup [2] - 81:5, 81:7
11:25, 32:21, 37:12,	- 49:23	156:21, 157:1,	225:7, 226:7, 226:9,	draft [1] - 227:19
38:15, 86:19,		157:3, 158:17,	226:11, 226:15,	drafts [1] - 58:2
111:15, 205:17	dispute [9] - 53:3, 63:6, 92:13, 158:13	158:19, 159:14,	226:21, 227:5,	dramatic [1] - 10:12
directors [3] - 84:11,	158:14, 182:24, TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP 2, 227:14,	dramatically [10] -
			1	
	M	lason & Lockha	irt	

10:10, 13:20, 15:2,	Drought [12] - 34:12,	Е	64:4, 124:19,	12:24, 19:3, 25:15,
34:15, 63:4, 80:4,	34:18, 34:20, 35:16,	E	128:14, 133:10,	41:10, 55:21,
102:12, 160:18,	35:22, 36:1, 36:4,	e-mail [10] - 56:23,	143:17, 166:9, 181:1	108:13, 131:17,
160:25, 199:20	37:5, 37:16, 42:14,	57:3, 111:14,	effective [1] - 88:21	142:11, 174:24,
draw [2] - 49:3, 146:22	85:8, 114:7	111:21, 111:24,	effectively [4] - 34:2,	193:7, 201:9,
drawing [1] - 17:7	drought [38] - 9:25,	179:12, 179:16,	87:24, 99:12, 103:16	223:17, 223:21
draws [1] - 17:17	11:24, 12:2, 13:13,	179:24, 180:2,	effectiveness [1] -	End [1] - 237:20
dredge [7] - 131:10,	15:22, 16:1, 17:1,	181:18	86:25	endangered [23] -
218:15, 222:14,	17:5, 34:22, 34:24,	e.g [1] - 199:22	effects [10] - 12:5,	20:6, 30:20, 63:11,
223:23, 224:3,	36:1, 36:4, 37:15,	early [5] - 26:14,	16:1, 141:5, 144:17,	63:12, 63:15, 67:15,
224:5, 224:23	39:5, 39:21, 50:5,	32:13, 220:2,	169:2, 169:13,	67:20, 68:8, 68:20,
dredged [2] - 73:9,	50:7, 55:13, 70:20,	222:13, 230:17	195:18, 208:12,	72:11, 73:7, 83:13,
142:24	76:19, 77:2, 77:8,	ears [1] - 106:24	230:8, 230:10	140:7, 144:8,
dredges [1] - 130:16	79:20, 80:21, 85:10,	easements [1] - 39:2	Effects [1] - 229:3	153:18, 154:22,
dredging [62] - 63:6,	86:20, 88:24, 89:1,	easier [6] - 119:25,	efficiency [3] - 79:9,	171:19, 201:24,
64:1, 64:7, 66:21,	89:6, 89:13, 89:25,	159:13, 217:23,	79:14, 86:25	203:13, 207:14,
127:17, 128:18,	90:4, 91:7, 91:10,	220:8, 233:5, 233:7	efficient [3] - 40:6,	208:10, 213:12,
128:21, 129:2,	92:10, 95:24, 99:23,	easiest [1] - 16:15	103:10, 117:20	236:1
129:5, 129:20,	147:24	easing [1] - 138:13	effort [5] - 35:1, 60:23,	Endangered [4] -
130:1, 131:24,	drought-induced [1] -	East [1] - 60:4	135:7, 203:11,	159:21, 199:4,
133:15, 136:18,	147:24	eastern [2] - 56:4,	223:17	203:23, 213:24
136:20, 142:9,	droughts [12] - 13:11,	120:22	efforts [4] - 78:23,	endangering [1] -
142:22, 142:24,	13:24, 15:5, 15:6,	easy [2] - 106:13,	80:16, 81:4, 88:1	211:1
143:15, 143:17,	16:2, 31:25, 36:18,	223:11	egg [3] - 25:9, 25:10,	endeavored [1] -
144:17, 181:16,	63:16, 69:22, 72:19,	eat [1] - 229:14	26:23	107:12
189:9, 189:13,	78:10, 206:6	echoing [1] - 88:16	eggs [1] - 25:11	ended [1] - 131:23
189:15, 189:21,	drove [1] - 86:6	ECHOLS [2] - 1:23,	eight [1] - 14:4	ends [2] - 51:1, 103:5
189:24, 191:18,	dry [14] - 11:18, 16:23,	6:15	either [9] - 68:13,	enforcement [1] -
195:3, 195:18,	16:25, 31:7, 31:11,	Echols [1] - 6:14	72:6, 81:7, 92:18,	59:15
197:1, 197:6,	75:17, 84:3, 85:16,	ecological [3] - 20:4,	103:2, 104:12,	engaged [2] - 85:17,
218:13, 218:16,	85:20, 96:2, 101:17,	52:17, 52:19	119:7, 144:2, 219:1	87:19
218:20, 219:13,	101:25, 229:11,	ecologically [1] - 26:9	elaborate [2] - 163:24,	Engineers [15] - 50:7,
219:16, 219:19,	236:22	ecologist [1] - 97:14	168:17	77:5, 88:5, 91:22,
219:22, 219:24,	due [9] - 60:24, 73:18,	Ecology [1] - 54:5	element [1] - 102:17	92:12, 118:25,
220:5, 220:11,	142:8, 142:13,	ecology [9] - 24:18,	elements [3] - 29:19,	119:9, 133:14,
220:15, 221:1,	153:7, 153:12,	24:25, 61:14, 62:9,	46:21, 46:24	134:16, 138:12,
221:3, 221:7,	222:14, 223:5,	62:14, 63:5, 87:21,	elevated [2] - 29:6,	143:6, 154:5,
221:15, 222:7,	228:22	97:6, 97:8	143:4	154:15, 155:22,
222:9, 222:12,	dug [2] - 64:7, 129:25	economic [8] - 42:24,	elevation [4] - 182:5,	208:16
222:13, 222:16,	Dunlap [1] - 117:22	47:13, 47:21, 50:18,	184:8, 190:12, 228:9	Engineers' [1] -
222:19, 223:1,	DUNLAP [1] - 1:25	51:16, 52:1, 52:13,	elevations [1] - 64:6	199:14
223:2, 223:6,	duration [1] - 94:8	52:16	eliminate [2] - 40:12,	English [1] - 184:11
227:25, 228:23,	during [30] - 8:2,	economist [4] - 49:18,	102:1	enlarge [1] - 178:12
230:14, 232:20	11:18, 32:11, 32:12,	51:21, 52:6, 101:22	eliminated [2] - 92:6,	enlargement [1] -
dried [1] - 136:5	34:21, 34:23, 36:6,	economists [1] -	130:12	65:21
dried-out [1] - 136:5	39:5, 40:13, 60:11,	51:17	eliminating [1] - 98:11	ensure [1] - 223:21
drier [3] - 66:13,	60:25, 70:20, 77:2,	economy [10] - 47:19,	elimination [1] -	Ensuring [1] - 110:21
78:13, 90:4	79:20, 85:5, 85:10,	48:8, 48:10, 49:22,	100:16	entered [2] - 103:21,
driest [1] - 76:8	86:13, 88:24, 91:7,	50:1, 50:13, 51:20,	Ellis [2] - 5:24, 6:2	202:22
drills [1] - 25:2	129:25, 201:16,	52:8, 52:9, 81:6	elsewhere [1] - 42:4	entire [15] - 12:15,
drinking [1] - 47:17	206:5, 206:9,	ecosystem [13] -	embrace [1] - 107:13	14:18, 20:4, 20:10,
drive [1] - 85:18	212:12, 214:9,	20:10, 20:18, 21:8,	emphasize [2] - 43:11,	31:9, 47:18, 68:24,
driven [1] - 60:13	216:15, 217:24,	23:24, 30:18, 31:4,	47:11	74:13, 126:15,
drop [2] - 76:25, 80:8	223:15, 224:19,	31:13, 31:16, 42:9,	emphatically [2] -	129:6, 187:2,
dropped [3] - 52:10,	230:19	74:13, 160:19,	47:5, 84:9	214:23, 222:2,
62:3, 81:2	duties [1] - 119:2	160:25, 199:21	employees [2] - 11:14,	229:25, 233:23
dropping [3] - 165:10,	dynamics [2] - 54:15,	ecosystems [3] -	119:12	entitled [6] - 1:10,
229:10, 229:21	55:14	19:23, 23:2, 23:21	employs [2] - 40:9,	8:17, 94:19, 110:20,
drops [2] - 164:18,		edged [1] - 88:19	109.22	113:13, 127:12
165:6	THI	E REPORTING G	ROUP _] - 12:19,	entity [4] - 12:13, 50:8,
			1 <u> </u>	

71 of 93 sheets

r				
200:7, 212:16	established [5] -	excessive [3] - 60:7,	Experience [1] -	93:13
entrenchment [3] -	45:13, 46:3, 161:24,	83:21, 207:3	113:16	extensively [1] - 53:15
161:25, 162:3,	162:17, 200:16	exclusively [1] - 70:10	experienced [5] -	extirpation [1] -
162:23	estimate [2] - 100:20,	executive [3] - 5:9,	78:7, 92:5, 189:8,	166:15
environment [1] - 97:5	184:2	6:19, 205:17	189:15, 212:12	extra [2] - 89:25, 188:1
environmental [4] -	estimated [4] - 55:9,	exercise [2] - 45:9,	experimentation [1] -	extraordinary [4] -
26:24, 33:3, 41:24,	137:16, 187:8,	50:14	25:6	45:4, 45:9, 56:23,
180:19	212:10	exhibit [12] - 7:10,	experiments [3] -	106:23
Environmental [17] -	estimates [4] - 69:17,	7:14, 12:20, 18:18,	26:18, 27:3, 28:25	extreme [6] - 13:7,
4:16, 5:16, 12:1,	99:16, 100:5, 148:13	18:20, 110:14,	expert [35] - 26:13,	13:9, 19:2, 99:11,
15:20, 18:11, 32:17,	estuaries [1] - 29:13	111:5, 112:4, 113:2,	29:12, 29:13, 52:12,	235:13, 237:1
33:16, 37:12, 37:24,	estuary [4] - 23:24,	115:20, 179:11,	59:3, 61:14, 61:23,	extremely [2] - 164:8,
38:11, 38:16, 64:20,	24:7, 24:12, 29:19	229:1	62:2, 65:17, 65:20,	233:17
79:7, 84:11, 104:25,	evaluate [1] - 14:10	Exhibit [48] - 15:16,	66:24, 67:7, 73:20,	
108:2, 111:16	evaluates [1] - 97:15	17:21, 18:16, 33:14,	74:17, 80:6, 81:2,	F
EnviroScience [9] -	evaluating [2] - 56:4,	34:14, 35:8, 36:10,	82:22, 89:11, 89:18,	FA 2
200:7, 200:20,	200:11	37:13, 37:23, 38:25,	90:25, 91:14, 91:16,	FA-2 [1] - 215:1
201:11, 201:17,	event [2] - 70:11,	108:10, 108:14,	95:8, 97:3, 97:19,	faces [1] - 44:22
202:8, 212:7,	238:8	108:23, 109:2,	98:18, 99:21,	facilitate [2] - 117:19,
212:10, 212:15,	events [4] - 28:22,	109:13, 109:18,	100:22, 101:22,	119:20 facilities [1] - 174:17
212:22	29:2, 206:5, 206:10	109:22, 110:3,	143:20, 188:20,	fact [40] - 8:23, 19:15,
EnviroScience's [1] -	evidence [24] - 28:8,	110:6, 110:9,	190:5, 191:6,	21:17, 23:5, 27:22,
201:1	29:11, 44:19, 45:14,	110:13, 111:5,	191:19, 228:8	35:15, 50:6, 58:17,
envy [1] - 78:20	45:17, 50:22, 51:5,	111:8, 111:13,	experts [22] - 9:21,	60:12, 62:5, 64:23,
EP [1] - 37:11	51:6, 51:14, 52:23,	111:20, 111:25,	9:24, 13:7, 22:11,	68:7, 69:22, 73:21,
EPA _[3] - 20:3, 21:6,	55:17, 56:16, 56:25,	112:3, 112:9,	22:14, 25:5, 30:8,	78:21, 79:15, 80:13,
93:6	61:17, 61:18, 67:6,	112:21, 113:2,	39:19, 51:18, 53:16,	80:19, 82:1, 91:21,
EPD [3] - 84:22, 86:18,	68:9, 68:12, 71:18,	113:7, 113:11,	62:25, 73:11, 74:15,	95:20, 130:11,
87:23	74:16, 74:20, 77:24,	113:19, 113:23, 114:4, 114:14,	92:7, 96:1, 97:8, 98:16, 99:17, 100:9,	131:17, 133:7,
EPD's [1] - 89:7	88:10, 102:19	114:19, 114:24,	100:17, 119:5,	135:4, 142:13,
equilibrium [3] -	evolving [1] - 97:3	115:4, 115:12,	148:21	144:7, 149:1,
225:12, 232:23,	exact [2] - 124:2,	115:19, 119:16,	experts' [1] - 98:21	152:13, 152:20,
232:24	131:7	127:6, 146:10,	Expires [1] - 238:17	158:23, 166:10,
equipment [3] - 44:1,	exactly [18] - 11:14,	146:13, 171:10,	explain [11] - 9:24,	166:23, 171:22,
86:15, 87:1 equitable [14] - 8:12,	26:15, 26:19, 28:6, 36:7, 37:4, 41:5,	205:11	26:15, 30:17, 32:18,	183:3, 207:10,
8:17, 8:19, 8:22,	46:7, 87:15, 89:22,	exhibited [1] - 206:6	37:4, 59:11, 89:9,	219:18, 225:16,
9:14, 38:17, 45:3,	90:18, 122:7, 124:1,	exhibits [2] - 117:21,	94:8, 101:23, 128:5,	231:9, 233:23
45:23, 46:23, 46:24,	139:6, 139:13,	225:20	177:22	factor [1] - 36:21
52:20, 74:21, 94:13,	153:24, 158:1,	EXHIBITS [1] - 2:10	explained [6] - 35:10,	factors [1] - 9:2
103:7	172:11	exist [4] - 9:1, 69:4,	38:20, 45:17, 45:21,	facts [15] - 34:7,
era [1] - 13:19	EXAMINATION [4] -	69:14, 174:7	89:17, 159:17	45:24, 46:1, 46:8,
erosion [4] - 133:8,	105:21, 117:9,	existed [1] - 36:24	explaining [1] - 38:13	49:2, 50:21, 56:21,
133:10, 188:7, 189:2	118:6, 218:4	existence [5] - 67:4,	explains [4] - 34:19,	58:17, 70:7, 88:19,
erroneous [1] - 45:22	examination [2] -	73:4, 141:7, 155:12,	39:1, 61:15, 66:4	90:23, 91:13,
error [1] - 101:5	106:4, 106:7	173:22	explanation [3] -	102:14, 102:16,
ESA [1] - 171:18	examine [1] - 112:11	existing [2] - 64:8,	71:15, 77:22, 95:15	102:18
especially [2] - 104:2,	examining [1] - 116:7	125:13	exploded [2] - 9:23,	factual [6] - 204:10,
195:10	example [3] - 16:12,	expand [2] - 126:16,	23:9	204:15, 204:22,
ESQ [13] - 1:17, 1:17,	25:25, 99:18	164:4	explodes [1] - 22:19	205:6, 210:8, 215:1
1:18, 1:18, 1:19,	examples [1] - 79:21	expanded [2] - 14:8,	exponentially [1] -	failed [2] - 47:16,
1:19, 1:21, 1:21,	exceeded [3] - 20:16,	86:14	83:1	102:15
1:22, 1:22, 1:23,	21:13, 33:21	expanse [1] - 202:23	expressed [2] -	fails [1] - 62:16
1:24, 1:25	exceeds [1] - 100:13	expectancy [1] -	151:10, 151:12	failure [2] - 27:9, 74:19
essential [1] - 31:3	exception [3] -	223:22	expressly [1] - 60:18	fair [2] - 8:11, 209:14
essentially [6] - 9:6,	100:11, 123:12,	expensive [2] - 42:16,	extend [1] - 29:15	fairly [2] - 221:2,
46:21, 59:13,	123:13	80:24	extended [2] - 206:6,	234:10
216:16, 216:21,	excerpts [3] - 55:4,	experience [3] -	216:15	faith [2] - 35:1, 42:14
217:15	106:18, 106:19	91:20, 152:18,	extension [1] - 60:9	fall [2] - 10:16, 60:11
establish [1] - 83:20	excess [1] - 90:17 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP ;ive [2] - 16:8,	
	N	lagon & Tockha	• rt	1

falls [1] - 49:24	123:19, 124:5,	42:7, 50:24, 51:1,	56:10, 223:15	225:18, 234:3,
familiar [7] - 118:20,	137:13, 137:17,	75:8, 75:24, 78:2,	fishing [4] - 59:14,	234:17, 234:21,
160:12, 175:9,	144:2, 187:10,	90:19, 95:8, 101:15,	60:6, 60:23, 61:5	235:2, 235:7,
199:13, 205:15,	203:4, 226:14, 227:6	108:5, 115:9, 122:4,	five [5] - 48:2, 93:4,	235:12, 235:21
212:22, 219:6	felt [1] - 23:9	123:14, 128:1,	93:16, 171:7, 174:21	floodplains [5] - 30:7,
family [1] - 26:3	few [10] - 7:6, 7:12,	137:12, 144:11,	fix [3] - 9:14, 41:25,	65:14, 136:6,
far [10] - 12:23, 23:8,	12:2, 13:15, 13:22,	154:3, 155:20,	42:1	140:12, 181:2
23:9, 23:10, 63:20,	21:21, 69:24, 85:15,	158:22, 164:20,	fixed [1] - 143:18	floodwaters [1] -
66:18, 77:13,	146:1, 146:15	171:6, 184:1, 184:7,	fixtures [1] - 79:14	64:10
120:10, 161:20,	fewer [3] - 14:23,	192:20, 193:10,	FL-ACF-03671820 [1]	FLORIDA [1] - 1:3
200:23	74:15, 99:2	197:19, 203:25,	- 179:14	Florida [285] - 1:17,
fares [1] - 62:10	fiction [1] - 90:21	210:13, 212:9,	flashed [1] - 93:6	3:10, 4:13, 4:21, 5:1,
farmers [10] - 11:6,	field [4] - 28:25, 59:7,	219:16, 219:19,	Flat [1] - 136:9	5:10, 8:3, 8:9, 8:16,
12:2, 33:1, 34:6,	144:5, 183:10	220:3, 220:14,	flat [1] - 80:12	12:18, 17:20, 18:15,
39:4, 41:20, 41:23,	fields [1] - 220:19	223:3, 230:13,	flatten [2] - 234:9,	19:13, 22:15, 23:3,
42:1, 43:2, 99:6	figure [2] - 37:20,	230:16	234:11	23:15, 25:18, 27:14,
fat [26] - 67:19, 68:21,	144:4	firsthand [2] - 160:10,	flatter [1] - 234:23	28:2, 28:7, 33:14,
68:25, 69:2, 69:18,	figures [3] - 70:17,	160:14	fleet [1] - 60:6	34:13, 35:2, 35:4,
70:1, 70:3, 70:12,	81:15, 81:23	Fish [66] - 20:3, 21:6,	Flewelling [4] - 97:19,	35:8, 36:10, 36:21,
71:7, 71:12, 146:7,	file [7] - 8:19, 78:2,	35:8, 54:6, 57:6,	97:20, 98:10, 101:1	37:22, 40:8, 41:7,
146:25, 147:19,	112:7, 112:10,	63:14, 64:17, 64:21,	Flewelling's [1] -	42:19, 43:5, 43:7,
148:5, 148:14,	112:15, 112:22,	69:1, 69:9, 69:23,	100:20	43:15, 44:1, 44:21,
149:11, 150:3,	124:2	70:18, 71:3, 72:4,	Flint [64] - 8:10, 10:14,	44:25, 46:8, 46:20,
155:13, 159:24,	filed [23] - 37:18,	72:15, 83:7, 93:11,	10:15, 10:16, 10:17,	47:1, 47:24, 48:2,
167:4, 171:19,	54:20, 100:9,	93:15, 117:2,	10:10, 10:10, 10:17, 10:20, 11:1, 11:2,	48:4, 48:7, 48:9,
172:9, 199:7, 203:3,	155:25, 157:23,	118:23, 119:2,	11:3, 11:19, 12:3,	48:18, 49:5, 49:16,
210:1, 212:11	158:17, 163:22,	119:8, 134:13,	15:17, 17:14, 17:15,	49:24, 50:2, 50:17,
favor [1] - 103:22	166:20, 168:25,	134:14, 145:23,	17:22, 18:3, 18:5,	51:2, 51:10, 51:12,
Fawal [1] - 4:7	170:12, 170:24,	146:5, 146:13,	19:3, 19:10, 19:17,	51:16, 51:22, 52:2,
FAWAL [2] - 1:19, 4:9	172:4, 173:18,	146:24, 147:4,	33:9, 33:23, 33:25,	52:6, 52:10, 52:12,
February [1] - 95:8	198:5, 203:7, 204:6,	147:12, 147:14,	34:11, 34:16, 34:18,	52:17, 52:22, 53:4,
Federal [2] - 159:21,	204:13, 204:16,	147:21, 147:23,	34:19, 34:23, 35:6,	53:12, 53:17, 53:25,
216:11	204:25, 208:2,	148:10, 148:18,	35:11, 35:16, 35:18,	54:6, 54:20, 55:16,
federal [52] - 8:13,	210:14, 210:24,	149:9, 149:20,	35:22, 36:1, 36:4,	55:18, 55:23, 56:19,
12:12, 19:21, 20:6,	211:22	150:10, 150:13,	36:13, 37:5, 37:15,	56:24, 57:4, 57:11,
21:24, 27:16, 27:19,	files [2] - 112:8, 120:9	151:1, 151:21,	37:16, 38:2, 40:3,	57:22, 59:2, 59:13,
33:24, 47:15, 60:18,	filing [3] - 8:14,	151:22, 152:4,	40:5, 40:18, 41:2,	59:18, 60:14, 60:17,
62:21, 64:16, 71:15,	211:12, 211:19	152:6, 152:14,	42:14, 47:15, 76:23,	61:4, 61:11, 61:20,
73:11, 83:4, 83:9,	fill [3] - 31:20, 64:6,	159:18, 159:19,	76:24, 76:25, 77:2,	61:22, 62:1, 62:3,
88:15, 88:25, 92:15,	125:10	160:5, 173:8,	85:8, 85:16, 85:19,	62:12, 62:16, 62:22,
92:20, 96:8, 96:14,	filled [1] - 13:6	173:24, 179:22,	86:8, 87:17, 89:2,	62:23, 62:25, 64:17,
96:25, 142:4,	final [3] - 73:14, 93:25,	180:10, 182:3,	91:4, 91:7, 91:11,	64:18, 64:19, 64:22,
155:10, 159:17,	97:2	194:25, 195:16,	108:12, 113:15,	64:24, 65:13, 65:20,
160:1, 160:5,	finally [2] - 131:22,	195:22, 195:23,	113:24, 134:20,	66:4, 66:22, 66:24,
160:15, 160:21,	131:23	196:13, 197:2,	135:5	67:2, 68:5, 68:21,
161:6, 161:13,	financial [1] - 41:19	199:1, 199:12, 214:5, 215:16	Flint-Ochlockonee [2]	69:5, 70:6, 70:24,
400.00 405.0	findings [3] - 55:2,	214:5, 215:16,	- 17:22, 108:12	71:4, 71:21, 72:7,
163:22, 165:2,		1777716		
165:21, 172:4,	86:7, 151:23	233:15	flip [4] - 66:3, 202:5,	72:21, 73:16, 73:20,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3,	-	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12,	flip [4] - 66:3, 202:5, 228:25, 231:14	74:16, 74:25, 75:12,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1,	86:7, 151:23	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4,	• • • •	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16,	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7,	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11,	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9,	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15,	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25,	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21,	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9,	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21, 215:16, 216:20,	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9, 233:6, 237:11	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7, 235:17	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18, 118:18, 127:23,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:22, 78:24, 79:1,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21, 215:16, 216:20, 217:14	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9, 233:6, 237:11 finish [1] - 140:19	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7, 235:17 fisheries [2] - 54:1,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18, 118:18, 127:23, 131:19, 135:22,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:22, 78:24, 79:1, 80:17, 80:25, 81:1,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21, 215:16, 216:20, 217:14 feed [2] - 31:1, 234:17	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9, 233:6, 237:11 finish [1] - 140:19 finished [1] - 152:25	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7, 235:17 fisheries [2] - 54:1, 227:14	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18, 118:18, 127:23, 131:19, 135:22, 139:10, 139:22,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:22, 78:24, 79:1, 80:17, 80:25, 81:1, 81:6, 81:11, 81:15,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21, 215:16, 216:20, 217:14 feed [2] - 31:1, 234:17 feeds [1] - 16:19	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9, 233:6, 237:11 finish [1] - 140:19 finished [1] - 152:25 firm [2] - 54:14,	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7, 235:17 fisheries [2] - 54:1, 227:14 fishery [9] - 27:4,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18, 118:18, 127:23, 131:19, 135:22, 139:10, 139:22, 140:15, 141:11,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:22, 78:24, 79:1, 80:17, 80:25, 81:1, 81:6, 81:11, 81:15, 81:20, 81:23, 82:20,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21, 215:16, 216:20, 217:14 feed [2] - 31:1, 234:17 feeds [1] - 16:19 feet [13] - 13:17,	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9, 233:6, 237:11 finish [1] - 140:19 finished [1] - 152:25 firm [2] - 54:14, 200:10	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7, 235:17 fisheries [2] - 54:1, 227:14 fishery [9] - 27:4, 27:14, 27:17, 27:18,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18, 118:18, 127:23, 131:19, 135:22, 139:10, 139:22, 140:15, 141:11, 141:16, 141:19,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:22, 78:24, 79:1, 80:17, 80:25, 81:1, 81:6, 81:11, 81:15, 81:20, 81:23, 82:20, 83:1, 83:13, 83:15,
165:21, 172:4, 172:24, 173:3, 174:15, 175:1, 203:8, 203:16, 206:3, 207:11, 208:2, 209:15, 209:21, 214:21, 215:16, 216:20, 217:14 feed [2] - 31:1, 234:17 feeds [1] - 16:19	86:7, 151:23 fine [10] - 7:15, 104:7, 104:9, 139:16, 169:23, 185:25, 186:21, 194:9, 233:6, 237:11 finishe [1] - 140:19 finished [1] - 152:25 firm [2] - 54:14, 200:10 first [44] - 9:15, 10:4,	fish [15] - 30:7, 31:12, 61:18, 61:25, 62:4, 62:5, 64:3, 66:9, 81:5, 133:22, 133:24, 134:7, 134:18, 223:7, 235:17 fisheries [2] - 54:1, 227:14 fishery [9] - 27:4, 27:14, 27:17, 27:18,	228:25, 231:14 floodplain [33] - 29:25, 30:4, 31:3, 31:18, 31:20, 32:4, 63:19, 65:25, 66:8, 66:12, 66:19, 96:18, 118:18, 127:23, 131:19, 135:22, 139:10, 139:22, 140:15, 141:11,	74:16, 74:25, 75:12, 75:14, 75:20, 76:2, 76:5, 76:13, 76:14, 76:16, 76:25, 77:5, 77:13, 77:22, 78:9, 78:10, 78:12, 78:14, 78:22, 78:24, 79:1, 80:17, 80:25, 81:1, 81:6, 81:11, 81:15, 81:20, 81:23, 82:20,

90:8, 90:24, 91:14,	52:7, 52:8, 57:6,	75:18, 82:16, 87:17,	140:15, 141:11,	future [2] - 8:5, 81:14
91:16, 91:17, 92:7,	58:7, 58:20, 59:11,	90:17, 91:6, 91:7,	141:19	Future [1] - 110:22
92:10, 92:17, 92:23,	61:9, 62:10, 65:17,	91:9, 93:1, 93:7,	forests [1] - 66:11	FWC [2] - 57:16, 143:5
92:24, 93:1, 93:3,	67:7, 70:9, 72:6,	93:18, 93:19, 96:16,	forgive [2] - 181:12,	
93:18, 94:3, 94:5,	73:12, 74:19, 75:23,	96:17, 99:8, 167:16,	-	FX [2] - 109:22,
			198:2	110:18
94:8, 94:23, 95:3,	76:22, 77:16, 77:19,	167:22, 168:19,	form [9] - 128:1,	FX-10 [2] - 2:16, 34:13
95:5, 96:1, 96:8,	78:21, 79:3, 81:10,	172:19, 191:11,	133:7, 133:13,	FX-109 [1] - 2:22
97:4, 97:14, 97:19,	82:22, 87:7, 89:17,	202:2, 206:4,	133:20, 137:12,	FX-16 [1] - 2:17
98:18, 100:4,	91:23, 94:1, 99:17,	206:13, 208:13,	137:21, 139:18,	FX-18 [1] - 2:17
102:10, 102:15,	99:20, 100:8,	212:12, 216:14,	140:3, 233:25	FX-24 [1] - 2:18
102:25, 103:8,	100:17, 103:15,	224:20, 230:8,	formal [1] - 64:12	FX-259 [1] - 2:22
103:12, 103:18,	104:24, 117:2,	230:10, 230:13,	former [3] - 11:25,	FX-36 [1] - 2:18
106:17, 108:11,	154:13, 158:5,	230:15, 230:19,	32:21, 164:3	FX-4 [2] - 2:16, 111:1
108:14, 108:23,	169:1, 175:5,	230:20, 230:22,	formerly [1] - 25:18	FX-46 [1] - 2:19
109:2, 109:13,	207:14, 210:25,	230:23, 231:2,	Fort [2] - 219:2, 219:4	FX-49b [1] - 2:19
109:22, 110:2,	220:3	232:25, 233:1,	forward [3] - 22:5,	
110:3, 110:6, 110:9,	Florida-Georgia [1] -	233:3, 235:14,	44:19, 86:7	FX-49d1 [1] - 2:20
110:13, 111:5,	120:24	236:24, 237:2		FX-65 [1] - 2:20
111:8, 111:13,	Floridan [6] - 16:14,	Flows [2] - 185:19,	forwarded [1] - 181:20	FX-66 [1] - 2:21
111:20, 111:25,	16:18, 17:17, 18:2,	229:3	forwarding [1] - 180:2	FX-85 [1] - 2:21
112:2, 112:9,	83:24, 84:2	Floyd [1] - 5:6	foundational [2] -	
112:21, 113:2,			24:24, 29:16	G
	flow [46] - 13:16, 19:6,	FLOYD [1] - 5:7	four [7] - 6:1, 14:17,	
113:6, 113:11,	19:10, 21:8, 22:15,	fly [1] - 102:13	21:13, 21:15, 95:10,	GA [14] - 110:10,
113:19, 114:19,	29:3, 30:21, 31:5,	focus [12] - 9:11, 10:6,	95:11, 103:11	110:15, 111:5,
114:24, 115:12,	34:15, 35:2, 49:4,	19:20, 42:12, 67:14,	fourth [1] - 91:15	111:10, 111:21,
115:18, 116:25,	54:15, 54:19, 55:20,	76:22, 84:22,	fraction [1] - 164:8	112:4, 112:24,
117:4, 118:9,	64:10, 65:22, 77:8,	108:10, 108:14,	frame [3] - 84:19,	113:4, 113:8,
119:12, 120:24,	77:21, 89:4, 91:25,	119:22, 135:9,	142:25, 220:2	113:20, 114:16,
121:24, 130:8,	92:1, 92:10, 92:19,	154:20	frankly [1] - 32:18	115:1, 115:8, 115:21
131:22, 142:22,	93:3, 99:2, 142:13,	focused [5] - 18:19,	-	gage [6] - 12:11, 13:4,
145:16, 148:17,	142:14, 161:3,	22:9, 96:2, 129:14,	Fred [1] - 3:20	18:23, 76:23, 77:15,
149:9, 153:16,	166:14, 167:18,	139:17	FREDERICK [1] - 1:18	121:24
154:4, 154:21,	172:20, 184:4,	focuses [4] - 36:12,	freezing [1] - 38:22	Gage [12] - 12:17,
155:11, 155:17,	184:19, 186:16,	110:9, 113:19, 115:8	frequency [2] - 55:13,	12:23, 19:1, 121:20,
155:18, 155:22,	187:8, 187:14,	focusing [3] - 48:11,	78:11	
156:4, 157:17,	190:14, 191:4,	-	frequent [1] - 237:1	122:8, 126:18,
159:18, 166:20,	191:16, 208:24,	83:17, 230:10	frequently [1] - 66:1	129:9, 176:21,
169:4, 169:14,		folder [2] - 112:10,	fresh [3] - 24:8, 24:15,	187:10, 202:3,
172:3, 173:2,	211:3, 227:16,	112:12	132:3	211:4, 218:25
	228:11, 234:4,	follow [8] - 98:5,	freshwater [6] - 53:6,	gain [1] - 103:17
173:14, 173:17,	234:25, 236:11	107:9, 107:21,	55:12, 55:20, 56:7,	Gaines [2] - 219:2,
173:20, 174:1,	flowed [1] - 76:14	119:25, 129:16,	134:1, 199:6	219:4
174:11, 174:15,	Flowing [1] - 185:5	156:17, 159:13,	front [6] - 61:22,	gallery [1] - 4:3
174:25, 181:8,	flowing [4] - 8:18,	192:11	100:19, 156:21,	gallons [3] - 16:17,
182:3, 188:20,	76:12, 186:19, 187:3	follow-up [1] - 129:16		16:20, 80:7
189:9, 198:6, 201:6,	flows [89] - 11:19,	following [6] - 57:9,	157:1, 197:17, 225:20	Gary [2] - 179:17,
203:8, 203:12,	12:24, 13:2, 13:7,	69:15, 109:16,	225:20	179:19
203:18, 203:20,	13:9, 13:16, 13:22,	202:2, 216:12,	full [8] - 104:3, 105:9,	gather [1] - 229:14
204:1, 205:17,	14:1, 14:3, 14:13,	202.2, 210.12, 221:23	116:19, 129:18,	gears [1] - 153:15
209:16, 210:10,	15:1, 15:7, 15:22,	food [6] - 29:15,	149:4, 171:6,	• · ·
211:11, 211:20,	16:3, 20:7, 20:16,		230:25, 231:13	General [2] - 4:22,
211:23, 212:5,	20:18, 21:4, 21:10,	47:18, 61:14, 61:19, 62:7, 220:16	fully [3] - 159:14,	6:24
213:5, 213:23,	22:25, 24:2, 24:5,	62:7, 229:16	208:21, 209:18	general [2] - 5:15,
214:21, 215:19,	24:6, 26:11, 27:5,	foot [6] - 124:8, 128:8,	fundamental [5] -	85:7
215:25, 216:12,		144:5, 211:9, 226:16	15:8, 24:17, 26:8,	generally [3] - 80:12,
216:20, 217:14,	27:24, 28:4, 30:15,	football [3] - 144:5,	36:22, 81:21	85:23, 171:10
218:20, 222:6,	30:19, 32:2, 32:6,	144:12, 220:19	fundamentally [4] -	generate [5] - 80:24,
	36:13, 36:25, 39:14,	football-size [1] -	31:15, 36:14, 36:15,	90:22, 95:11,
222:8, 222:25, 224:1, 231:6, 232:10	39:24, 49:15, 50:5,	144:12	36:25	100:24, 149:7
224:1, 231:6, 232:10	53:23, 54:21, 55:8,	foregoing [1] - 238:4	funded [1] - 36:11	generates [1] - 48:13
Florida's [48] - 4:15,	55:12, 55:25, 58:19,	fama at 01.01	funding [1] - 37:17	generating [1] - 100:9
9:6, 23:12, 38:16,	58:23, 65:24, 75 THI		ROUP [2] - 37:7, 60:17	generations [2] - 32:6,
50:25, 51:6, 51:20,	1111		[2] - 37:7, 60:17	3
	M	lason & Lockha	.rt	
				74 of 93 shee

	1			
43:17	103:17, 106:3,	GRANT [1] - 6:25	138:24, 148:4,	harming [4] - 42:1,
gentleman [6] - 18:6,	106:6, 108:1,	graph [2] - 190:17,	148:12, 155:15,	42:2, 43:2, 154:22
28:11, 33:6, 59:21,	108:17, 109:3,	190:19	162:23, 162:25,	harms [7] - 8:24, 9:6,
107:25, 224:4	110:1, 111:17,	gravel [1] - 218:25	163:4, 163:24,	46:10, 62:11, 62:14,
gently [1] - 225:5	112:9, 112:17,	GRAY [1] - 1:24	164:3, 165:24,	94:10, 141:19
geography [1] - 219:7	113:15, 115:13,	gray [1] - 65:7	173:11, 173:21,	Harold [2] - 84:20,
Geological [3] - 12:12,	115:15, 119:16,	greater [2] - 93:19,	178:3, 195:4,	111:16
64:11, 180:6	120:24, 121:6,	201:21	223:15, 225:6,	Harvard [1] - 49:19
geomorphologists [1]	127:5, 130:8,	greatest [1] - 86:12	229:8, 229:13,	harvest [3] - 26:4,
- 223:19	134:13, 135:2, 161:19, 174:12,	greatly [2] - 138:1,	229:19, 230:4, 233:21, 235:25	26:6, 55:14
GEORGIA [1] - 1:6	218:17, 218:19,	139:19	habitats [12] - 63:7,	harvesting [6] - 60:4,
Georgia [174] - 1:21,	219:4, 219:8,	greed [1] - 61:6	64:8, 66:8, 132:1,	60:5, 60:7, 60:8, 60:21, 60:25
5:25, 6:18, 6:24, 8:2, 8:7, 8:16, 8:18, 9:3,	219:11, 225:23	green [4] - 49:8, 82:8,	132:3, 135:15,	hate [1] - 98:14
9:7, 9:23, 10:7,	Georgia's [70] - 8:21,	181:4, 234:3 Greenberg [1] - 98:2	136:2, 136:15,	Hathorn [1] - 180:14
10:24, 11:13, 12:24,	9:4, 9:18, 12:1, 12:5,	grew [1] - 80:14	140:5, 202:15,	head [7] - 84:5, 89:7,
15:12, 15:13, 15:19,	18:10, 19:17, 19:20,	ground [1] - 16:11	228:20, 235:17	96:11, 179:21,
16:6, 17:19, 17:25,	22:6, 22:11, 22:14,	grounds [2] - 135:4,	half [10] - 9:10, 32:11,	179:23, 180:18,
18:20, 22:1, 28:10,	27:11, 27:25, 32:12,	213:23	98:11, 98:19, 98:25,	180:19
31:6, 33:8, 33:20,	32:16, 33:2, 33:16,	groundwater [7] -	101:10, 101:20,	head-on [1] - 84:5
34:4, 34:8, 34:25,	33:24, 37:24, 38:15,	16:11, 17:7, 17:13,	150:5, 187:4, 211:9	heads [1] - 57:7
35:5, 35:9, 35:14,	40:15, 46:16, 46:17,	17:16, 83:23, 85:1,	halted [1] - 42:17	heads-up [1] - 57:7
36:7, 36:12, 37:3,	47:8, 49:12, 49:18,	99:21	hand [7] - 105:2,	health [6] - 19:21,
37:19, 38:3, 38:5,	49:25, 50:11, 50:12,	group [4] - 28:7, 92:6,	116:12, 117:6,	20:4, 20:10, 20:17,
38:10, 38:23, 39:8,	51:19, 52:3, 59:3,	112:6, 181:14	117:24, 136:7,	43:16, 96:21
40:7, 41:9, 41:16,	61:14, 67:3, 68:5,	grow [3] - 10:12,	136:9, 238:10	healthy [3] - 31:4,
41:21, 42:3, 42:10,	73:19, 74:25, 76:9,	81:13, 229:15	handed [2] - 117:11,	42:8, 42:9
42:13, 43:25, 44:16,	76:11, 78:3, 78:4, 81:3, 81:12, 81:15,	growing [6] - 48:15,	208:1	hear [3] - 58:11,
44:24, 46:11, 46:12,	81:17, 82:17, 83:20,	50:15, 71:14, 83:1,	handing [1] - 163:15	151:19, 156:24
46:17, 47:2, 47:5, 47:21, 47:24, 48:1,	87:23, 88:16, 89:10,	87:8, 147:20	handling [1] - 134:25	heard [2] - 29:10, 96:3
48:3, 48:6, 48:8,	90:5, 94:5, 97:11,	grown [2] - 10:10,	happy [2] - 57:13, 132:16	hearing [2] - 105:4,
48:13, 48:21, 49:7,	98:19, 98:25, 99:6,	80:3	hard [16] - 45:24, 46:1,	116:14
49:16, 49:20, 49:24,	99:22, 100:6,	growth [4] - 11:10,	46:8, 50:21, 58:17,	HEARING [1] - 1:10
50:11, 51:13, 52:15,	101:22, 102:22,	17:9, 46:16, 232:8	88:19, 90:23, 91:13,	hears [1] - 74:10
52:18, 53:5, 54:21,	103:21, 113:24,	guess [1] - 153:23	98:5, 102:16,	heel [1] - 34:3
55:25, 57:11, 58:10,	114:7, 156:11,	guidance [2] - 21:6,	102:18, 119:20,	height [2] - 125:11, 184:12
58:15, 60:13, 61:8,	218:10, 225:21,	94:24	144:3, 220:7, 221:5	held [2] - 1:11, 26:3
62:13, 62:18, 63:8,	226:6, 226:25, 229:1	guideline [1] - 21:19	hardship [1] - 50:18	
63:10, 63:21, 66:22,	Georgians [1] - 47:14	guidelines [4] - 19:21, 20:2, 21:24, 93:7	harm [36] - 27:23,	Helen [14] - 65:9, 180:3, 180:5,
66:25, 68:10, 68:12,	given [5] - 52:21,	Gulf [22] - 24:14,	41:19, 46:2, 51:12,	180:21, 182:4,
70:8, 70:15, 71:11,	78:22, 119:20,	24:16, 54:8, 71:20,	52:13, 52:16, 52:18,	184:25, 185:8,
72:12, 72:13, 73:10,	151:11, 193:16	72:1, 73:4, 125:8,	52:19, 55:17, 61:12,	186:3, 186:9,
74:12, 74:21, 75:3,	Glibert [1] - 29:13	134:7, 134:9,	61:13, 61:18, 61:24,	206:19, 211:16,
75:7, 75:19, 75:25,	God [2] - 105:6,	134:24, 142:2,	62:4, 67:2, 68:10,	211:21, 212:2
76:4, 76:21, 77:6,	116:16	142:4, 155:12,	68:13, 68:16, 70:8,	help [8] - 88:14, 94:25,
77:9, 77:14, 78:6,	government [9] -	155:15, 161:10,	70:25, 71:18, 73:10,	105:6, 116:16,
78:7, 78:10, 78:14, 79:15, 79:18, 83:5,	12:12, 27:16, 34:5, 60:18, 62:21, 64:16,	161:16, 161:18,	73:13, 78:24, 95:22,	119:3, 119:5,
83:18, 84:6, 84:12,	64:21, 71:15, 230:17	162:25, 165:24,	125:14, 143:13, 143:14, 144:24	223:18, 223:21
84:19, 85:25, 86:2,	Governor [5] - 6:19,	171:18, 172:8, 173:7	143:14, 144:24, 145:3, 145:7,	helped [1] - 64:23
86:14, 87:9, 87:19,	8:1, 8:15, 60:17,	GX-72 [3] - 2:24,	145:3, 145:7, 145:10, 171:17,	helpful [1] - 194:1
88:20, 89:7, 89:12,	60:21	119:16, 225:23	232:15, 233:2, 233:3	hereby [1] - 238:3
89:23, 92:25, 94:4,	grade [1] - 196:6	GX-91 [2] - 2:24, 170:5	Harm [1] - 141:23	high [7] - 9:24, 34:14,
94:11, 95:5, 97:25,	graduate [2] - 149:24,	••	harmed [11] - 50:13,	52:21, 79:13,
98:12, 99:13, 99:19,	149:25	Н	51:20, 67:11, 71:22,	224:19, 224:20,
100:2, 101:14,	Graham [1] - 186:4	habitat [32] - 61:5,	140:12, 142:2,	227:16
101:16, 101:19,	Grant [1] - 6:24	64:2, 69:13, 69:16,	142:6, 142:8,	higher [8] - 10:3,
101:25, 103:3,	grant [2] - 142:7,	72:10, 72:14, 73:6,	145:18, 172:1,	14:25, 15:2, 21:16, 26:10, 27:6, 100:10
103:7, 103:9,	224:11 TH		ROUP 9	26:10, 27:6, 100:10, 184:4
				т.т Т.
L	M	lason & Lockha	rt	

75 of 93 sheets

____ Mason & Lockhart_ . uge 200 to 200 of 2,1

The Reporting Group (207) 797-6040

highest [2] - 214:7,	188:5, 191:2,	112:6, 112:14,	203:25, 207:25	impression [1] -
226:14	191:15, 191:20,	112:20, 113:1,	idly [2] - 84:7, 85:4	142:17
highlight [4] - 64:14,	193:16, 194:3,	113:6, 113:10,	ignores [1] - 46:21	improve [2] - 86:24,
81:9, 119:21, 175:11	196:21, 197:10,	113:18, 113:22,	II [1] - 23:11	97:5
highlighted [1] - 21:12	197:15, 198:12,	114:6, 114:13,	illegal [2] - 40:23, 61:1	improved [1] - 86:1
highlighting [2] -	203:6, 203:21,	114:18, 115:3,	illegally [2] - 40:12,	improving [2] - 146:8,
24:1, 149:2	205:4, 206:1, 208:1,	115:6, 115:11,	40:19	148:2
highlights [1] - 30:13	209:1, 210:7,	115:17, 115:24,	illustrate [1] - 136:12	IN [1] - 238:10
highly [2] - 83:24,	213:22, 215:13,	116:6, 116:10,	imaginary [1] - 9:7	incentives [1] - 79:13
131:25	216:10, 217:13,	116:24, 117:18,	immediate [3] - 12:25,	inch [2] - 187:5
highway [2] - 220:13	217:23, 218:6	117:19, 118:2,	46:4, 46:13	inches [2] - 14:23,
himself [1] - 157:4	Hoehn's [1] - 132:7	119:19, 125:21,	immediately [2] -	203:3
hired [6] - 51:17, 63:1,	hold [3] - 153:7,	132:15, 140:16,	86:21, 125:2	incident [3] - 58:12,
81:2, 90:25, 91:18,	153:12, 224:17	146:19, 156:20,	impact [16] - 39:22,	179:6, 215:21
188:20	Hole [1] - 60:4	156:25, 157:14,	52:2, 66:18, 77:1,	include [8] - 29:16,
historic [4] - 86:20,	home [1] - 48:21	157:15, 159:11,	79:24, 87:17,	29:17, 31:25, 108:4,
92:13, 112:8, 234:12	Honor [167] - 3:9,	163:13, 169:16,	142:15, 160:17,	178:22, 199:6,
historical [9] - 12:15,	3:15, 3:19, 3:22, 4:5,	170:4, 176:8, 192:8,	160:25, 162:19,	230:20, 232:4
13:1, 123:1, 188:8,	4:9, 4:10, 4:19, 4:21,	192:24, 193:6,	165:22, 172:20,	included [8] - 58:1,
189:3, 189:9,	4:23, 4:25, 5:7, 5:12,	197:11, 207:20,	190:23, 199:19,	92:14, 130:21,
189:15, 189:21,	5:19, 5:23, 6:5, 6:9,	217:21, 220:8,	208:10, 228:3	175:14, 178:9,
237:3	6:12, 6:15, 6:21,	237:4, 237:10	impacted [5] - 17:16,	199:25, 202:12,
historically [2] -	6:25, 7:2, 7:5, 7:11,	honorably [1] - 87:24	29:22, 188:6, 189:2,	211:16
177:20, 233:1	7:19, 7:20, 7:21,	hook [1] - 236:5	214:23	includes [2] - 199:1,
history [11] - 13:14,	7:25, 8:13, 9:4, 9:9,	hoped [1] - 62:1	impacting [1] - 235:14	230:24
24:3, 34:17, 39:25,	9:17, 10:13, 10:20,	Hornberger [5] - 9:20,	impacts [18] - 22:25,	including [9] - 16:5,
62:17, 62:19, 64:12,	11:9, 12:5, 13:2,	89:18, 89:22, 90:3, 90:8	23:8, 29:16, 29:18,	20:13, 20:23, 22:17,
65:18, 92:22, 94:15,	13:21, 14:11, 14:22,		31:21, 33:23, 51:22,	39:20, 79:12, 83:12,
179:6	17:8, 17:11, 18:9, 18:15, 18:21, 18:24,	hostile [1] - 32:23	66:20, 75:16, 87:4,	84:17, 165:12
hitting [1] - 235:10	19:5, 19:12, 19:19,	hot [1] - 236:19 hours [2] - 55:1, 79:17	97:15, 126:9, 160:6,	incomplete [1] - 85:2
Hoehn [83] - 2:6,	19:25, 20:11, 20:19,	huge [2] - 30:20,	166:2, 197:1, 223:2,	inconveniences [1] -
116:22, 117:1,	20:24, 21:18, 21:25,	101:5	231:3	102:10
117:11, 117:24,	22:23, 24:20, 25:3,	human [3] - 231:9,	impeachment [1] -	incorrect [2] - 151:13,
118:8, 119:10,	25:8, 25:15, 25:22,	231:11, 231:25	132:16	152:23
119:17, 120:4, 120:23, 121:10,	26:13, 27:15, 28:4,	hundred [1] - 101:20	imperiled [3] - 160:7, 169:4, 169:14	increase [5] - 60:23,
120:23, 121:10, 122:13, 122:25,	28:16, 30:25, 31:18,	hundreds [2] - 25:11,		77:7, 81:18, 100:5, 187:17
122.13, 122.23, 124:4, 126:5, 127:3,	32:1, 32:9, 32:24,	26:6	implement [1] - 94:12 implementation [1] -	
129:14, 130:15,	33:13, 34:10, 35:4,	hurt [1] - 33:24		increased [7] - 29:3,
131:24, 132:6,	35:23, 36:10, 37:2,	hydraulic [2] - 131:10,	172:6 implemented [1] -	133:8, 133:10, 187:14, 187:23,
132:10, 132:21,	37:10, 38:8, 39:2,	224:5	39:13	197.14, 197.23, 191:4, 191:8
132:24, 133:2,	39:8, 40:13, 41:11,	hydrologic [6] - 76:16,	important [22] - 15:14,	increases [3] - 29:5,
135:9, 137:3,	41:21, 42:7, 42:18,	78:8, 97:12, 124:20,	17:23, 18:22, 21:9,	91:6, 190:14
138:17, 141:8,	43:5, 43:10, 43:20,	138:1, 139:18	22:4, 33:13, 35:7,	increasing [6] - 68:1,
142:16, 143:16,	43:24, 53:10, 57:1,	hydrology [9] - 14:5,	36:9, 38:20, 39:22,	70:3, 78:11, 87:3,
144:23, 146:23,	69:8, 88:2, 94:1,	15:8, 36:16, 36:23,	43:10, 46:20, 63:20,	145:17
152:25, 153:2,	94:14, 104:7,	89:8, 89:10, 89:18,	63:23, 78:7, 83:2,	incredibly [1] - 103:10
153:15, 154:2,	104:11, 104:22,	89:19, 205:21	87:22, 95:17,	indeed [6] - 27:24,
154:12, 156:12,	105:16, 106:3,		175:25, 229:8,	33:6, 37:18, 41:7,
157:17, 157:23,	106:14, 107:1,		233:12, 233:17	41:14, 43:1
163:5, 163:18,	107:5, 107:12,		importantly [2] -	independently [1] -
163:23, 165:20,	108:6, 108:9,	Idaho [1] - 88:17	70:16, 89:16	59:4
166:5, 167:2,	108:22, 109:1,	idea [4] - 71:7, 71:22,	impose [2] - 75:25,	INDEX [1] - 2:1
167:20, 168:1,	109:12, 109:16, 109:20, 109:24	150:15, 191:14	86:25	indicate [3] - 164:16,
168:23, 170:2,	109:20, 109:24,	identified [5] - 27:12,	imposed [5] - 45:5,	168:23, 183:24
170:11, 171:8,	110:8, 110:12, 110:17, 110:25,	60:19, 137:12, 140:3, 142:18	79:10, 79:16, 79:18,	indicated [15] - 3:4,
171:10, 174:6,	110:17, 110:25, 111:4, 111:7,	140:3, 142:18 identifies [1] - 22:3	85:6	141:3, 143:6, 146:9,
176:13, 179:16,	111:4, 111:7, 111:23,	identify [6] - 38:20,	imposing [1] - 77:8	148:10, 148:17,
182:2, 182:18,	111.24 112.2		impoundment [1] -	148:20, 167:3,
184:17, 188:1,	THI	E REPORTING G	ROUP)	185:8, 197:5,
	M	lason & Lockha	rt	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	76 of 93 shee

220:11, 224:3,	integrated [1] - 77:3	34:21, 34:23, 35:21,	join [1] - 54:9	kept [1] - 54:24
224:25, 232:22,	intend [1] - 117:21	36:14, 37:9, 39:3,	joined [1] - 58:25	key [6] - 47:5, 47:23,
233:8	intense [2] - 10:8,	40:7, 40:8, 40:24,	Joint [11] - 15:16,	53:24, 55:4, 59:9,
indication [1] - 36:17	11:3	41:2, 41:6, 42:15,	37:13, 38:25,	66:13
individual [3] - 41:20,	intensive [2] - 10:21,	42:25, 43:3, 83:18,	113:23, 114:4,	killed [6] - 167:11,
63:17, 148:15	60:5	83:20, 83:23, 84:2,	114:14, 115:4,	216:15, 216:21,
individually [1] -	intently [1] - 84:22	84:23, 85:10, 86:12,	146:12, 204:2,	217:15, 220:4, 222:6
198:20	interaction [1] - 86:12	86:16, 86:21, 87:1,	204:3, 213:8	killing [3] - 31:12,
individuals [1] - 69:20	interest [2] - 8:4,	97:23, 98:12, 99:20,	joint [2] - 7:9, 7:14	71:11, 167:15
induced [1] - 147:24	45:22	99:23, 102:2	jon [2] - 227:17,	Kimbro [2] - 26:14,
industrial [4] - 75:4,	interested [1] - 38:1	issue [8] - 16:7, 35:5,	227:18	28:18
79:15, 100:19, 232:7	interesting [1] - 98:15	35:14, 58:6, 68:16,	Jonathan [3] - 2:3,	Kimbro's [1] - 28:24
inflated [1] - 99:16	interfere [1] - 96:24	112:16, 128:22,	104:23, 105:12	kind [7] - 126:21,
inflow [2] - 202:22,	Interim [1] - 214:13	193:8	JOSHUA [1] - 1:25	144:3, 194:7,
206:15	Interior [1] - 166:11	issued [4] - 27:16,	journal [2] - 55:3,	213:15, 223:11,
inflows [3] - 53:6,	internal [5] - 11:12,	72:17, 93:16, 95:13	57:14	233:11, 233:23
56:7, 76:18	32:13, 32:16, 37:3,	issues [9] - 47:2, 96:3,	Jud [1] - 86:18	Kirkland [2] - 5:24, 6:2
influence [1] - 234:25	119:4	96:10, 148:22,	Judgment [2] - 204:3,	knowing [1] - 139:13
information [13] -	internally [1] - 39:9	149:6, 151:19,	213:8	knowledge [3] -
22:10, 64:23, 70:1,	internally [1] - 39:9	152:1, 181:16,	judgment [5] - 74:21,	160:10, 160:14,
71:25, 119:4, 119:6,		227:17	103:21, 203:13,	165:9
122:22, 148:23,	intervenors [1] - 155:22	issuing [1] - 35:20	203:23, 210:9	knowledgeable [1] -
151:11, 206:22,		items [1] - 26:12	July [9] - 21:3, 178:16,	205:20
207:12, 227:4	introduce [5] - 3:11,	itself [5] - 16:19, 72:7,	178:20, 179:2,	known [4] - 34:7,
informed [1] - 165:4	3:24, 4:11, 6:1, 6:18	72:16, 76:24, 225:11	179:24, 181:24,	151:21, 172:7, 203:2
infrastructure [1] -	introduced [3] - 5:15,	,,	182:10, 187:13,	knows [7] - 81:20,
39:25	43:12, 43:13	J	217:9	82:20, 92:23, 92:25,
initial [1] - 34:12	inundate [3] - 96:18,		June [1] - 238:17	93:1, 93:20
initiated [1] - 85:11	184:13, 187:21	James [2] - 91:18,	Justice [1] - 71:19	Kondolf [11] - 65:18,
initiatives [2] - 85:13,	inundated [2] -	180:13	justice [1] - 45:5	65:19, 188:18,
85:19	186:20, 209:9	JAMIE [1] - 1:17	justify [1] - 52:20	189:6, 190:2, 190:5,
injunction [4] -	inundation [3] - 66:7,	Jamie [1] - 3:14		191:3, 191:17,
injunction [4] -				
• • • •	141:12, 181:2	January [2] - 170:25,	juvenile [2] - 29:7,	
157:18, 157:22,	invasion [1] - 45:12	January [2] - 170:25, 171:1	59:25	191:19, 195:17,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] -	-	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15	171:1	59:25 JX-109 _[3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5	191:19, 195:17,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13	191:19, 195:17, 195:20
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] -	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] -	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet [2] - 195:24,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 lacks [1] - 37:17
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet [2] - 195:24, 196:23	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] -	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet [2] - 195:24, 196:23 input [2] - 64:16,	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 lacks [1] - 37:17 lagoon [1] - 24:12
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet [2] - 195:24, 196:23 input [2] - 64:16, 93:14	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 K	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 lacks [1] - 37:17 lagoon [1] - 24:12 laid [1] - 53:11
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction [3] - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury [14] - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet [2] - 195:24, 196:23 input [2] - 64:16, 93:14 inquiry [1] - 55:22	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - 110:2 involving [1] - 8:14	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 lacks [1] - 37:17 lagoon [1] - 24:12 laid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6$, 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9$, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24$, 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16$, 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 K Kaeser [11] - 149:22,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 lacks [1] - 37:17 lagoon [1] - 24:12 laid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involves [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 K Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L labeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 lack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 lacks [1] - 37:17 lagoon [1] - 24:12 laid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23,
$\begin{array}{c} 157:18,\ 157:22,\\ 157:24,\ 163:11\\ \textbf{Injunction}\ [3]-158:6,\\ 170:9,\ 170:19\\ \textbf{injury}\ [14]-46:9,\\ 46:24,\ 50:23,\ 51:3,\\ 51:7,\ 51:10,\ 51:11,\\ 51:15,\ 51:16,\ 58:17,\\ 62:10,\ 74:19,\ 103:1\\ \textbf{inlet}\ [2]-195:24,\\ 196:23\\ \textbf{input}\ [2]-64:16,\\ 93:14\\ \textbf{inquiry}\ [1]-55:22\\ \textbf{insects}\ [1]-229:14\\ \textbf{insert}\ [1]-48:18\\ \textbf{inside}\ [1]-224:9\\ \end{array}$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 K Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4,	$\begin{array}{c} 191:19,\ 195:17,\\ 195:20\\ \hline \textbf{Kondolf's}\ [1]\ -\ 188:13\\ \hline \textbf{L}\\ \hline \textbf{labeled}\ [3]\ -\ 117:11,\\ 126:20,\ 220:22\\ \hline \textbf{lack}\ [2]\ -\ 94:3,\ 223:14\\ \hline \textbf{lacks}\ [1]\ -\ 37:17\\ \hline \textbf{lagoon}\ [1]\ -\ 24:12\\ \hline \textbf{laid}\ [1]\ -\ 53:11\\ \hline \textbf{Lake}\ [13]\ -\ 11:1,\\ 90:12,\ 90:14,\ 121:1,\\ 126:19,\ 126:23,\\ 134:19,\ 165:12,\\ \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} 157:18, \ 157:22, \\ 157:24, \ 163:11 \\ \hline { lnjunction } [3] - 158:6, \\ 170:9, \ 170:19 \\ \hline { injury } [14] - 46:9, \\ 46:24, \ 50:23, \ 51:3, \\ 51:7, \ 51:10, \ 51:11, \\ 51:15, \ 51:16, \ 58:17, \\ 62:10, \ 74:19, \ 103:1 \\ \hline { inlet } [2] - 195:24, \\ 196:23 \\ \hline { input } [2] - 64:16, \\ 93:14 \\ \hline { inquiry } [1] - 55:22 \\ \hline { insects } [1] - 229:14 \\ \hline { insert } [1] - 48:18 \\ \hline { inside } [1] - 224:9 \\ \hline { instability } [1] - 195:1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$ irrigate [4] - $11:6$,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 K Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25,	$\begin{array}{c} 191:19,\ 195:17,\\ 195:20\\ \hline \textbf{Kondolf's}\ [1]\ -\ 188:13\\ \hline \textbf{L}\\ \hline \textbf{labeled}\ [3]\ -\ 117:11,\\ 126:20,\ 220:22\\ \hline \textbf{lack}\ [2]\ -\ 94:3,\ 223:14\\ \hline \textbf{lacks}\ [1]\ -\ 37:17\\ \hline \textbf{lagoon}\ [1]\ -\ 24:12\\ \hline \textbf{laid}\ [1]\ -\ 53:11\\ \hline \textbf{Lake}\ [13]\ -\ 11:1,\\ 90:12,\ 90:14,\ 121:1,\\ 126:19,\ 126:23,\\ 134:19,\ 165:12,\\ 174:18,\ 199:22,\\ \hline \end{array}$
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$ inside $[1] - 224:9$ instability $[1] - 195:1$ install $[1] - 79:13$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$ irrigate [4] - $11:6$, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23
$\begin{array}{c} 157:18, \ 157:22, \\ 157:24, \ 163:11 \\ \hline { lnjunction } [3] - 158:6, \\ 170:9, \ 170:19 \\ \hline { injury } [14] - 46:9, \\ 46:24, \ 50:23, \ 51:3, \\ 51:7, \ 51:10, \ 51:11, \\ 51:15, \ 51:16, \ 58:17, \\ 62:10, \ 74:19, \ 103:1 \\ \hline { inlet } [2] - 195:24, \\ 196:23 \\ \hline { input } [2] - 64:16, \\ 93:14 \\ \hline { inquiry } [1] - 55:22 \\ \hline { insects } [1] - 229:14 \\ \hline { insect } [1] - 224:9 \\ \hline { instability } [1] - 195:1 \\ \hline { install } [1] - 79:13 \\ \hline { instances } [1] - 206:7 \\ \hline \end{array}$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$ irrigate [4] - $11:6$, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - $40:13$,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7,
$\begin{array}{c} 157:18, \ 157:22, \\ 157:24, \ 163:11 \\ \hline { lnjunction } [3] - 158:6, \\ 170:9, \ 170:19 \\ \hline { injury } [14] - 46:9, \\ 46:24, \ 50:23, \ 51:3, \\ 51:7, \ 51:10, \ 51:11, \\ 51:15, \ 51:16, \ 58:17, \\ 62:10, \ 74:19, \ 103:1 \\ \hline { inlet } [2] - 195:24, \\ 196:23 \\ \hline { input } [2] - 64:16, \\ 93:14 \\ \hline { inquiry } [1] - 55:22 \\ \hline { insects } [1] - 229:14 \\ \hline { insert } [1] - 48:18 \\ \hline { inside } [1] - 224:9 \\ \hline { instability } [1] - 195:1 \\ \hline { install } [1] - 79:13 \\ \hline { instances } [1] - 206:7 \\ \hline { instead } [2] - 78:1, \\ \end{array}$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$ irrigate [4] - $11:6$, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - $40:13$, 40:19, 40:24	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3]$ - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14]$ - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2]$ - 195:24, 196:23 input $[2]$ - 64:16, 93:14 inquiry $[1]$ - 55:22 insects $[1]$ - 229:14 insert $[1]$ - 48:18 inside $[1]$ - 224:9 instability $[1]$ - 195:1 install $[1]$ - 79:13 instances $[1]$ - 206:7 instead $[2]$ - 78:1, 91:9	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$ irrigate [4] - $11:6$, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - $40:13$, 40:19, 40:24 irrigating [1] - $17:14$	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] -
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$ inside $[1] - 224:9$ instability $[1] - 195:1$ install $[1] - 79:13$ instances $[1] - 206:7$ instead $[2] - 78:1,$ 91:9 Institute $[2] - 59:8,$	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - 110:2 involving [1] - 8:14 IOP [2] - 214:10, 214:13 irreparable [1] - 70:24 irrigate [4] - 11:6, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - 40:13, 40:19, 40:24 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigation [45] - 10:22,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18 job [3] - 119:2, 159:18,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25, 106:22, 169:19,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] - 1:11, 3:2, 3:13, 3:16,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$ inside $[1] - 224:9$ instability $[1] - 195:1$ install $[1] - 79:13$ instances $[1] - 206:7$ instead $[2] - 78:1,$ 91:9 Institute $[2] - 59:8,$ 179:22	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - 110:2 involving [1] - 8:14 IOP [2] - 214:10, 214:13 irreparable [1] - 70:24 irrigate [4] - 11:6, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - 40:13, 40:19, 40:24 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigating [4] - 11:0,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18 job [3] - 119:2, 159:18, 199:1	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] - 1:11, 3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21, 4:1, 4:6,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3]$ - 158:6, 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14]$ - 46:9, 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2]$ - 195:24, 196:23 input $[2]$ - 64:16, 93:14 inquiry $[1]$ - 55:22 insects $[1]$ - 229:14 insert $[1]$ - 48:18 inside $[1]$ - 224:9 instability $[1]$ - 195:1 install $[1]$ - 79:13 instances $[1]$ - 206:7 instead $[2]$ - 78:1, 91:9 Institute $[2]$ - 59:8, 179:22 instructed $[1]$ - 59:2	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - 110:2 involving [1] - 8:14 IOP [2] - 214:10, 214:13 irreparable [1] - 70:24 irrigate [4] - 11:6, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - 40:13, 40:19, 40:24 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigating [4] - 17:14 irrigating [4] - 17:14 irrigating [4] - 17:14 irrigating [4] - 10:22, 11:4, 11:7, 11:10, 11:17, 13:20, 15:23,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18 job [3] - 119:2, 159:18, 199:1 jobs [4] - 47:18, 47:20,	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25, 106:22, 169:19, 169:24, 209:9, 224:21	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] - 1:11, 3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:14, 4:20, 4:24,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$ inside $[1] - 224:9$ instability $[1] - 195:1$ install $[1] - 79:13$ instances $[1] - 206:7$ instead $[2] - 78:1,$ 91:9 Institute $[2] - 59:8,$ 179:22 insufficient $[1] - 88:9$	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - 110:2 involving [1] - 8:14 IOP [2] - 214:10, 214:13 irreparable [1] - 70:24 irrigate [4] - 11:6, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - 40:13, 40:19, 40:24 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigating [1] - 17:14 irrigating [4] - 11:2, 11:4, 11:7, 11:10, 11:17, 13:20, 15:23, 15:25, 16:4, 16:24,	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18 job [3] - 119:2, 159:18, 199:1 jobs [4] - 47:18, 47:20, 48:5, 50:12	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25, 106:22, 169:19, 169:24, 209:9,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] - 1:11, 3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:14, 4:20, 4:24, 5:4, 5:8, 5:13, 5:20,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$ inside $[1] - 224:9$ instability $[1] - 195:1$ install $[1] - 79:13$ instances $[1] - 206:7$ instead $[2] - 78:1,$ 91:9 Institute $[2] - 59:8,$ 179:22 insufficient $[1] - 88:9$ insult $[1] - 84:9$	invasion [1] - 45:12 invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - 82:17 investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - 20:25 involve [1] - 62:18 involved [3] - 57:22, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - 110:2 involving [1] - 8:14 IOP [2] - 214:10, 214:13 irreparable [1] - 70:24 irrigate [4] - 11:6, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - 40:13, 40:19, 40:24 irrigation [45] - 10:22, 11:4, 11:7, 11:10, 11:17, 13:20, 15:23, 15:25, 16:4, 16:24, 17:6, 17:10, 23:9	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18 job [3] - 119:2, 159:18, 199:1 jobs [4] - 47:18, 47:20, 48:5, 50:12 Johnson [1] - 5:2	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25, 106:22, 169:19, 169:24, 209:9, 224:21 keeps [2] - 95:3, 101:13	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] - 1:11, 3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:14, 4:20, 4:24, 5:4, 5:8, 5:13, 5:20, 6:6, 6:10, 6:13, 6:22,
157:18, 157:22, 157:24, 163:11 Injunction $[3] - 158:6,$ 170:9, 170:19 injury $[14] - 46:9,$ 46:24, 50:23, 51:3, 51:7, 51:10, 51:11, 51:15, 51:16, 58:17, 62:10, 74:19, 103:1 inlet $[2] - 195:24,$ 196:23 input $[2] - 64:16,$ 93:14 inquiry $[1] - 55:22$ insects $[1] - 229:14$ insert $[1] - 48:18$ inside $[1] - 224:9$ instability $[1] - 195:1$ install $[1] - 79:13$ instances $[1] - 206:7$ instead $[2] - 78:1,$ 91:9 Institute $[2] - 59:8,$ 179:22 insufficient $[1] - 88:9$	invasion [1] - $45:12$ invertebrates [1] - 229:15 invested [1] - $82:17$ investments [2] - 40:1, 78:15 invite [1] - $20:25$ involve [1] - $62:18$ involved [3] - $57:22$, 153:17, 154:4 involvement [1] - 92:11 involves [1] - $110:2$ involving [1] - $8:14$ IOP [2] - $214:10$, 214:13 irreparable [1] - $70:24$ irrigate [4] - $11:6$, 33:2, 39:4, 40:20 irrigated [3] - $40:13$, 40:19, 40:24 irrigating [1] - $17:14$ irrigating [1] - $17:14$ irrigating [4] - $11:22$, 11:4, 11:7, 11:10, 11:17, 13:20, 15:23, 15:25, 16:4, 16:24, 17:6, 17:10, 23:0	171:1 Jenkins [3] - 61:23, 62:2, 81:5 jeopardize [2] - 73:3, 173:22 jeopardizing [1] - 155:12 Jerry [6] - 180:10, 181:10, 181:11, 181:12, 181:21, 211:13 Jim [13] - 63:24, 66:20, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10, 122:18, 123:7, 123:12, 134:5, 161:14, 162:22, 164:5 Joanne [2] - 180:16, 180:18 job [3] - 119:2, 159:18, 199:1 jobs [4] - 47:18, 47:20, 48:5, 50:12 Johnson [1] - 5:2	59:25 JX-109 [3] - 2:13, 150:18, 151:5 JX-154 [1] - 2:13 JX-161 [2] - 2:14, 114:8 JX-168 [2] - 2:14, 193:23 JX-21 [1] - 2:12 JX-69 [2] - 2:12, 115:7 Kaeser [11] - 149:22, 150:8, 150:10, 150:12, 150:25, 151:3, 151:4, 151:20, 152:7, 152:17 Karen [1] - 6:11 KAREN [1] - 1:22 keep [6] - 56:25, 106:22, 169:19, 169:24, 209:9, 224:21 keeps [2] - 95:3,	191:19, 195:17, 195:20 Kondolf's [1] - 188:13 L Iabeled [3] - 117:11, 126:20, 220:22 Iack [2] - 94:3, 223:14 Iacks [1] - 37:17 Iagoon [1] - 24:12 Iaid [1] - 53:11 Lake [13] - 11:1, 90:12, 90:14, 121:1, 126:19, 126:23, 134:19, 165:12, 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7, 218:23 Iake [5] - 90:16, 207:7, 207:8, 207:12, 208:8 LANCASTER [60] - 1:11, 3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18, 3:21, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:14, 4:20, 4:24, 5:4, 5:8, 5:13, 5:20, 6:6, 6:10, 6:13, 6:22, 7:1, 7:3, 7:8, 7:15,

	1			
44:11, 103:24,	lawyer [2] - 157:7,	188:7, 189:3, 207:7,	154:3, 156:21,	looks [5] - 17:3, 17:5,
104:10, 104:13,	213:15	207:8, 207:12, 208:8	157:1, 157:4, 157:6,	98:3, 126:20, 136:12
104:20, 105:20,	lawyers [2] - 40:21,	Lewis [1] - 186:4	168:4, 168:24,	loop [4] - 177:21,
106:5, 106:9,	95:16	liberal [1] - 98:14	170:6, 173:3,	177:22, 234:15
106:12, 106:15,		life [4] - 26:2, 47:18,	173:14, 173:17,	
106:20, 116:4,	lead [3] - 51:21, 57:13, 100:6		198:15, 203:7, 216:1	loose [1] - 33:4
117:8, 117:17,		145:12, 223:22		lose [3] - 60:10,
117:25, 118:4,	lead-up [1] - 100:6	lifted [1] - 87:6	Litigation [1] - 197:19	229:25, 235:18
120:1, 125:23,	leader [1] - 59:6	light [8] - 56:21,	litigation-driven [1] - 60:13	loses [1] - 77:13
132:19, 156:23,	leading [3] - 54:17,	181:7, 181:19,		losing [2] - 235:16,
157:10, 169:20,	55:18, 179:6	185:15, 186:24,	live [6] - 24:23, 43:14,	235:17
192:6, 192:9,	leak [3] - 79:12, 80:18,	187:7, 209:4, 209:6	62:15, 87:25, 116:3, 118:12	loss [2] - 32:3, 163:24
192:13, 192:21,	100:23	Light [14] - 65:9,		lost [2] - 32:4, 32:5
193:3, 193:12,	leaky [1] - 80:20	180:3, 180:5,	living [2] - 50:15, 98:23	Low [1] - 229:3
207:21, 218:1,	learned [1] - 153:3	180:21, 182:4,		low [55] - 13:7, 13:9,
237:6, 237:11,	lease [1] - 26:4	183:11, 185:1,	localized [2] - 70:19, 147:25	13:15, 14:1, 14:3,
237:14	least [7] - 28:12, 39:9,	185:8, 186:3, 186:9,		15:22, 16:3, 19:15,
Lancaster [1] - 44:13	96:16, 132:1,	206:19, 211:16,	locally [2] - 147:1,	20:7, 21:10, 22:15,
land [2] - 40:24	138:23, 142:17,	211:21, 212:2	147:3	22:25, 24:15, 27:5,
landscape [4] - 63:4,	197:2	lightly [1] - 45:5	located [2] - 167:5,	27:24, 28:4, 29:2,
	leave [1] - 61:10	likely [4] - 28:22, 29:1,	189:7	30:14, 30:19, 36:13,
231:10, 231:11, 232:1	leaves [2] - 68:20,	32:22, 173:22	location [4] - 70:13,	36:22, 53:23, 54:19,
Langseth [3] - 99:21,	129:24	likewise [4] - 111:8,	131:7, 188:11, 189:2	54:21, 55:24, 58:23,
100:10, 100:15	led [9] - 29:3, 29:5,	112:21, 114:3,	locations [5] - 129:1,	99:2, 142:13,
	54:11, 58:7, 61:1,	114:14	130:2, 152:21,	142:14, 206:5,
Lanier [4] - 174:18, 199:22, 207:3, 207:7	84:13, 86:23, 87:24,	limit [2] - 33:22, 81:14	201:25, 214:6	206:9, 208:13,
	183:14	limited [5] - 34:2,	lock [5] - 122:3,	212:12, 222:14,
large [8] - 18:4, 147:15, 164:2,	left [6] - 12:14, 12:25,	90:16, 129:13,	134:17, 134:18,	223:14, 223:16,
	64:9, 94:10, 136:7,	140:9, 219:16	135:1, 167:17	227:16, 228:10,
172:18, 194:6,	164:8	limiting [1] - 61:5	Lock [1] - 161:14	230:8, 230:10,
202:21, 202:23, 203:2	left-hand [1] - 136:7	limits [2] - 43:2,	logistical [1] - 44:3	230:12, 230:14,
	legal [2] - 57:10, 58:3	133:21	long-running [1] -	230:19, 230:20,
largely [1] - 82:24	legislative [1] - 34:17	line [24] - 10:16,	53:2	230:22, 231:2,
larger [1] - 48:24	length [1] - 222:2	48:19, 49:5, 49:16,	long-term [4] - 39:11,	232:25, 233:1,
largest [3] - 48:22,	lengths [2] - 56:24,	63:3, 63:25, 75:11,	39:12, 200:17, 236:4	233:3, 235:14,
48:25, 235:1 last [33] - 13:23,	78:11	77:2, 87:9, 87:18,	long-time [2] - 96:11,	236:11, 236:21,
13:24, 14:15, 20:20,	lengthy [1] - 210:12	89:5, 90:7, 91:8,	180:22	236:23, 237:1
	less [12] - 14:22,	91:9, 93:3, 93:24,	look [30] - 7:22, 13:2,	lower [26] - 15:7,
22:9, 32:15, 36:24, 42:11, 42:12, 63:16,	24:11, 66:1, 69:10,	122:13, 122:17,	20:11, 20:14, 31:17,	15:23, 24:2, 24:5, 24:6, 26:11, 39:14,
	80:8, 99:7, 140:15,	123:2, 163:18,	44:19, 47:23, 51:24,	
72:17, 77:20, 84:14, 93:4, 93:16, 101:4,	141:11, 141:15,	163:23, 168:9,	52:7, 65:16, 67:23,	131:17, 136:24, 137:1, 137:4
	141:20, 211:3, 211:8	177:23, 196:3	75:6, 77:11, 82:5,	137:1, 137:4, 137:22, 140:8
109:10, 116:22, 135:20, 142:23,	letter [12] - 60:20,	lines [4] - 171:7,	124:2, 127:3, 137:4,	137:22, 140:8, 162:15, 176:5,
173:6, 184:1,	180:9, 181:10,	180:24, 194:3, 104:12	157:21, 158:1,	188:7, 189:3, 221:9,
184:23, 185:15,	181:20, 182:1,	194:12	158:22, 159:6,	223:12, 223:17,
196:14, 200:24,	182:19, 183:9,	link [1] - 28:8	164:14, 170:23, 171:2, 172:5, 101:0	228:4, 228:5, 228:6,
210:1, 216:5, 216:9,	183:24, 185:1,	Link [1] - 113:13	171:2, 173:5, 191:9,	220.4, 220.5, 220.0, 234:22
210.1, 210.5, 210.9, 219:7, 231:14,	211:12, 211:25,	Lipcius [3] - 59:4,	204:6, 205:24,	Lower [12] - 10:20,
236:24	212:1	59:6, 59:10	212:25, 232:18	11:2, 11:3, 17:22,
lasted [1] - 154:7	level [12] - 66:16,	lips [1] - 106:24	looked [9] - 16:7,	33:22, 38:2, 40:5,
late [2] - 58:2, 84:21	68:18, 94:4, 94:21,	list [1] - 79:21	51:22, 67:11, 72:15,	40:18, 41:2, 70:5,
latitude [1] - 157:8	117:2, 123:6, 162:2,	listed [5] - 159:21,	162:12, 175:22, 179:24, 217:5	108:11, 140:1
launched [1] - 137.8	162:16, 165:11,	160:2, 181:13,	178:24, 217:5, 230:18	lowered [3] - 66:6,
law [1] - 20:6	196:6, 229:10,	198:9, 199:3	230:18	123:19, 167:12
	229:21	literally [4] - 64:4,	looking [14] - 40:17,	lowering [5] - 64:5,
lawn [1] - 39:21	level-set [1] - 162:2	64:7, 131:11, 186:25	76:8, 90:18, 127:8,	65:23, 137:18,
laws [2] - 33:1, 33:3	levels [18] - 9:25,	litigation [24] - 60:13,	134:23, 140:25, 159:16, 162:6	168:15, 207:3
lawsuit [5] - 54:21,	20:21, 21:2, 65:1,	62:23, 74:14, 90:11,	158:16, 163:6, 164:14, 168:11	lowers [1] - 162:4
57:23, 58:8, 166:19, 169:1	65:23, 67:10, 82:16,	90:22, 103:11,	164:14, 168:11, 170:12, 171:4	lowest [2] - 32:2,
	95:6, 121:20,	153:8, 153:12,	170:12, 171:4,	76:10
lawsuits [1] - 78:2	165:10, 167:12, TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP 2, 232:18	70.10
	1		-	

lunch [5] - 104:6,	33:4	193:12, 207:21,	170:8, 170:18,	might [16] - 3:12, 3:25,
104:8, 104:9,	Manual [2] - 73:3,	218:1, 237:6,	204:2, 213:7	4:11, 12:20, 19:25,
104:10, 104:14	146:15	237:11, 237:14	memorandum [2] -	20:25, 67:16, 98:1,
	manuscript [1] - 58:3	material [7] - 22:13,	114:20, 114:25	99:5, 107:2, 107:5,
Μ	manuscripts [1] -	90:10, 130:10,	memory [3] - 130:4,	107:11, 139:3,
	57:14	131:14, 138:14,	155:1, 219:15	217:23, 237:5, 237:9
magnitude [1] - 45:13	map [14] - 18:25, 31:7,	224:16, 225:8	memos [2] - 85:14,	migrate [1] - 134:18
mail [10] - 56:23, 57:3,	86:16, 125:4,	math [3] - 187:19,	86:3	migration [1] - 161:16
111:14, 111:21,	125:16, 126:2,	187:20, 221:23	mention [7] - 47:17,	mile [13] - 126:22,
111:24, 179:12,	126:5, 126:11,	mathematical [1] -	61:11, 62:16, 85:24,	126:25, 129:8,
179:16, 179:24,	136:22, 176:2,	27:3	93:8, 93:10, 97:24	129:9, 176:22,
180:2, 181:18	176:8, 176:13,	Mathias [1] - 65:17	mentioned [15] - 31:1,	194:15, 201:18,
main [10] - 30:5, 31:2,	217:22, 220:22	Matt [2] - 126:1, 127:5	33:7, 50:8, 52:24,	221:19, 221:20,
57:25, 132:1,	mapped [4] - 69:17,	matter [5] - 1:10,	66:1, 66:11, 75:11,	221:22, 236:4
189:17, 189:19,	148:12, 149:4, 149:6	107:22, 111:9,	88:4, 95:19, 158:18,	miles [10] - 137:23,
189:20, 190:15,	March [2] - 114:1,	114:15, 147:10	171:25, 219:8,	194:18, 194:20,
191:5, 220:11	163:22	matters [1] - 21:8	220:18, 222:6, 236:3	194:21, 218:23,
Maine [3] - 1:13, 1:15,		••	mentions [2] - 47:1,	221:14, 221:24,
238:3	margins [1] - 30:22	maximum [1] - 99:23	79:1	221.14, 221.24, 222:4, 234:19,
mainstem [7] - 30:2,	Marian [1] - 181:20	Mayer [2] - 80:6, 82:6		
30:14, 200:18,	marine [1] - 24:22	Mayer's [1] - 80:10	menu [3] - 94:11,	235:11 millennia (g) 26:24
201:18, 206:15,	Marine [1] - 59:8	Mayor [2] - 4:25, 43:12	94:17, 94:20	millennia [2] - 36:24,
229:8, 234:16	Mark [1] - 25:16	McCARTAN [1] - 1:22	Menzie [1] - 61:15	42:8 Millor (4) - 9:1
maintain [2] - 20:9,	marked [4] - 119:16,	mean [13] - 13:15,	met [3] - 74:23,	Miller [1] - 8:1
211:8	126:11, 146:12,	29:25, 69:20,	102:25, 151:4	million [11] - 12:4,
Maintain [1] - 185:5	170:5	127:22, 149:10,	metering [1] - 86:15	16:20, 48:4, 48:5,
maintaining [3] -	marker [2] - 176:18,	186:25, 187:2,	method [1] - 107:14	48:17, 69:19, 69:21,
19:22, 89:4, 165:10	195:1	194:21, 196:5,	methodology [1] -	101:16, 101:21,
maintains [1] - 91:9	market [1] - 59:25	198:17, 209:4,	148:25	102:2, 149:11
maintenance [4] -	market-size [1] -	232:3, 232:14	Metro [5] - 10:8, 12:4,	millions [6] - 16:17,
130:6, 173:10,	59:25	meaning [3] - 77:18,	39:20, 39:22, 79:19	47:13, 47:20, 69:2,
195:3, 195:14	Mary's [1] - 59:7	127:24, 228:6	metro [11] - 48:24,	71:4, 71:16
major [8] - 8:9, 60:16,	masks [1] - 75:16	meaningful [1] - 92:24	78:18, 79:2, 79:6,	mills [1] - 219:2
69:22, 75:2, 79:3,	Mason [4] - 1:14,	means [12] - 20:17,	79:9, 80:15, 82:1,	mind [3] - 49:2, 52:5,
142:24, 220:14,	238:2, 238:15,	83:25, 123:18,	82:9, 83:14, 99:13,	71:19
220:16	238:15	123:21, 124:5,	100:23	mine [1] - 206:21
majority [10] - 49:14,	massive [2] - 63:3,	128:5, 131:11,	metropolitan [2] -	minimal [1] - 127:17
60:6, 75:13, 75:20,	73:8	162:3, 186:18,	47:9, 48:22	minimizing [1] - 45:22
82:11, 83:16, 129:2,	Master [2] - 44:12,	187:4, 194:18,	Mexico [3] - 24:14,	minimum [10] - 20:15,
	44:18	223:24	24:16, 45:16	21:4, 21:8, 21:12,
129:12, 220:24, 221:25	MASTER [60] - 1:11,	meant [1] - 65:22	MICHAEL [1] - 1:24	33:4, 77:7, 92:9,
	3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18,	measure [1] - 26:19	microscopic [1] -	93:1, 93:3, 93:18
mammal [1] - 74:8	3:21, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8,	measured [3] - 12:9,	61:12	minimums [1] - 20:22
manage [1] - 84:16	4:14, 4:20, 4:24, 5:4,	60:23, 185:22	mid-'70's [1] - 180:23	miniscule [1] - 98:22
managed [2] - 77:3,	5:8, 5:13, 5:20, 6:6,	measurement [3] -	mid-1980's [1] -	minor [3] - 102:9,
91:21	6:10, 6:13, 6:22, 7:1,	20:9, 186:6, 186:9	230:18	220:15, 221:13
Management [6] -	7:3, 7:8, 7:15, 7:23,	measurements [2] -	Middle [7] - 70:4,	minuscule [1] - 49:21
5:10, 64:19, 96:12,	43:21, 44:6, 44:11,	26:25, 186:1	139:25, 198:5,	minute [6] - 48:11,
113:15, 114:7,	103:24, 104:10,	measures [7] - 12:24,	203:17, 203:19,	128:21, 193:18,
205:18	104:13, 104:20,	26:23, 55:8, 79:11,	210:9, 213:4	197:21, 200:4, 234:1
management [4] -	105:20, 106:5,	79:23, 84:18, 122:11	middle [19] - 10:25,	minutes [4] - 7:18,
37:14, 91:20, 92:15,	106:9, 106:12,	measuring [2] - 122:8,	14:12, 73:8, 86:19,	44:4, 104:4, 192:9
108:4	106:15, 106:20,	202:2	128:22, 128:24,	mismanagement [2] -
manager [1] - 92:5	116:4, 117:8,	meet [2] - 44:21, 51:7	136:23, 137:1,	27:14, 27:21
managing [1] - 88:6	117:17, 117:25,	meeting [6] - 37:24,	137:4, 137:22,	misplaced [1] - 76:24
Managing [1] - 110:22	118:4, 120:1,	38:1, 38:10, 38:12,	138:2, 148:10,	misspoke [1] - 196:21
mandates [1] - 155:16	125:23, 132:19,	38:14, 57:9	202:17, 220:16,	mistake [1] - 98:8
mandatory [1] - 50:24	156:23, 157:10,	member [1] - 53:24	221:8, 221:10,	misunderstanding [1]
manipulate [1] -	169:20, 192:6,	members [3] - 32:16,	228:4, 228:5, 234:8	- 47:4
134:16	192:9, 192:13,	33:16. 167:4	Middle/Lower [1] -	mix [2] - 24:8, 24:10
manner [2] - 8:11,	192:21, 193:3, TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP)	mixture [2] - 131:12,
		Iscon & Tockha	I 	

79 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

131:14	131:9, 167:6,	114:23, 115:3,	78:21	114:20, 114:24,
model [6] - 89:20,	199:13, 214:8,	115:6, 115:11,	muscle [1] - 68:20	115:25
89:22, 90:11, 90:12,	220:25, 229:7, 235:5	115:17, 115:24,	mussel [23] - 68:24,	narrow [3] - 219:20,
90:17, 90:19	motion [8] - 88:8,	116:5, 116:6,	68:25, 70:17,	228:1, 234:2
Model [1] - 90:13	88:16, 89:17,	117:18, 118:1,	135:17, 140:8,	natal [1] - 135:4
modeling [2] - 27:3,	170:13, 170:21,	118:5, 118:7,	145:21, 146:6,	nation [1] - 48:23
84:24	170:24, 204:10,	119:19, 120:2,	146:25, 148:21,	native [1] - 166:16
models [2] - 85:2,	210:9	120:3, 125:21,	152:15, 152:19,	Natural [2] - 108:1,
85:12	Motion [5] - 158:5,	125:24, 126:4,	166:16, 173:21,	115:14
modern [4] - 128:7,	170:9, 204:2, 204:3,	127:5, 127:7, 131:1,	178:3, 179:23,	natural [13] - 23:5,
128:12, 219:17,	213:8	131:3, 132:7, 132:9,	195:4, 200:11,	23:14, 43:8, 49:18,
219:25	motivated [1] - 34:14	132:15, 132:20,	201:11, 201:17,	55:9, 63:7, 64:8,
modern-day [1] -	Mountain [6] - 138:9,	132:23, 133:4,	202:15, 213:25,	76:18, 84:8, 169:17,
219:17	138:21, 177:4,	133:6, 136:25,	214:7, 214:22	177:20, 225:5,
modification [1] -	177:6, 177:9, 220:23	137:2, 138:5, 138:6,	mussels [50] - 30:6,	228:21
173:21	mouth [1] - 190:25	140:20, 144:25,	30:20, 30:24, 31:12,	Nature [1] - 134:15
modify [1] - 73:5	move [11] - 61:10,	145:2, 146:19,	31:14, 63:11, 66:9,	nature [1] - 50:6
modifying [1] - 155:14	103:6, 106:8,	146:21, 157:15, 157:16, 159:11,	67:4, 67:14, 67:15,	navigation [14] -
moment [8] - 81:8,	134:19, 134:24,	159:16, 163:13,	67:20, 67:25, 68:6, 60:2, 70:10, 70:25	128:7, 128:13,
88:3, 92:4, 141:8,	135:25, 136:23,	163:14, 169:16,	69:3, 70:19, 70:25,	130:6, 143:14,
142:16, 154:25,	228:3, 233:20,	169:24, 170:1,	71:8, 142:5, 144:8, 148:15, 150:4,	163:1, 164:7, 172:7,
155:6, 165:16	236:14, 236:15	170:4, 170:10,	148:15, 150:4, 152:8, 153:18,	173:9, 188:9,
moments [1] - 147:10	moved [3] - 45:8,	176:10, 176:12,	160:2, 166:7,	194:20, 218:16,
monetary [1] - 52:2	143:3, 203:13	176:23, 177:2,	166:21, 166:24,	219:18, 219:25,
money [2] - 37:9,	moves [1] - 234:20	178:11, 178:13,	167:11, 167:15,	228:23
37:10	moving [1] - 187:6	179:10, 179:15,	168:12, 174:6,	near [3] - 12:17, 19:2,
monitor [4] - 45:20,	MR [164] - 3:9, 3:14,	192:4, 192:8,	178:15, 178:25,	112:16
82:5, 135:3, 207:8	3:17, 3:19, 3:20, 3:22, 3:23, 4:2, 4:4,	192:10, 192:17,	183:6, 187:23,	nearly [9] - 13:24,
monitoring [2] -		192:24, 193:6,	199:7, 201:24,	16:2, 16:3, 26:4,
201:17, 207:7	4:7, 4:9, 4:10, 4:15, 4:18, 4:21, 4:23,	193:14, 193:15,	210:2, 212:11,	116:5, 201:21, 201:23, 212:11
month [6] - 13:17,	4:25, 5:3, 5:5, 5:7,	193:25, 197:11,	215:23, 216:16,	necessarily [2] -
69:10, 72:17, 146:2,	5:9, 5:12, 5:14, 5:18,	197:14, 207:20,	216:21, 217:1,	194:21, 209:13
196:14, 202:2	5:22, 5:23, 6:8, 6:9,	207:22, 213:2,	217:15, 217:17,	necessary [7] - 3:5,
monthly [2] - 13:15, 75:18	6:11, 6:14, 6:15,	213:6, 216:6, 216:8,	229:19, 229:20,	20:9, 34:9, 46:25,
months [11] - 14:3,	6:16, 6:21, 6:23, 7:2,	217:2, 217:3, 217:20	235:25, 236:8,	61:7, 88:11, 226:21
14:4, 14:14, 14:16,	7:5, 7:11, 7:16, 7:21,	MS [19] - 3:15, 6:5,	236:11	need [21] - 33:9,
14:17, 21:21, 54:17,	7:24, 18:15, 25:22,	6:12, 6:25, 116:24,	mussels' [1] - 173:11	35:12, 37:14, 41:18,
75:17, 90:3, 95:14	43:24, 44:12, 104:7,	117:10, 140:16,	must [8] - 20:16,	44:2, 45:16, 60:13,
moratorium [3] - 85:6,	104:11, 104:16,	156:20, 156:25,	45:12, 45:13, 64:5,	91:24, 133:24,
86:23, 87:4	104:22, 105:22,	157:14, 169:22,	83:4, 87:21, 141:2,	147:8, 158:1, 158:8,
morning [37] - 3:2,	106:3, 106:6,	217:21, 218:2,	149:2	186:21, 194:6,
3:9, 3:15, 3:16, 3:18,	106:14, 106:17,	218:5, 231:16,		194:7, 221:3, 223:8,
3:19, 3:21, 3:22, 4:4,	107:1, 108:9,	231:18, 237:4,	N	229:15, 232:21,
4:6, 4:8, 4:9, 4:18,	108:22, 109:1,	237:8, 237:13	name [10] - 16:14,	234:1, 236:20
4:20, 4:23, 4:24, 5:3,	109:6, 109:9,	multi [2] - 29:4,		Needed [1] - 185:5
5:4, 5:7, 5:8, 5:12,	109:12, 109:16,	198:14	54:2, 81:4, 105:9, 105:10, 105:12	needed [16] - 39:11,
5:13, 5:18, 5:20,	109:20, 109:24,	multi-district [1] -	105:10, 105:12, 116:19, 116:21,	94:7, 96:19, 125:12,
5:23, 6:5, 6:7, 6:9,	110:5, 110:8,	198:14	116:22	131:13, 151:14,
6:10, 6:12, 6:13,	110:12, 110:17,	multi-year [1] - 29:4	named [10] - 18:7,	184:2, 184:19,
6:15, 6:21, 6:22,	110:25, 111:4,	multimillion [1] -	26:14, 28:11, 29:12,	187:17, 187:21,
6:25, 7:1, 57:5	111:7, 111:12,	223:16	107:25, 150:7,	190:14, 190:23,
mortality [7] - 29:7,	111:19, 111:23,	multiple [7] - 21:25,	180:3, 180:9, 186:4,	191:5, 191:12,
55:9, 55:20, 58:19,	112:2, 112:6,	30:8, 33:15, 53:16,	238:9	209:13, 223:20
70:11, 147:24, 214:8	112:14, 112:20,	62:20, 90:3, 180:24	Nancy [1] - 116:23	needing [1] - 125:10
most [19] - 31:9,	113:1, 113:6,	municipal [4] - 75:3,	Napoleon [13] - 2:4,	needs [12] - 41:25,
31:25, 63:23, 66:17,	113:10, 113:18,	79:14, 100:18, 232:7	18:7, 33:19, 87:11,	50:3, 50:23, 55:16,
67:7, 79:10, 83:19,	113:22, 114:3,	municipalities [1] -	107:25, 110:19,	61:21, 92:23, 93:21,
83:22, 84:13, 101:9,	114:6, 114:10,	82:17	111.15, 112:8.	94:6, 102:16,
101:10, 131:8,	114:13, 114:18, TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP <u>13, 113:13</u> ,	102:18, 103:13,
	л		1	
	• IV	lason & Lockha	II L	80 of 93 shee

259

184:12	52:13	154:16, 230:6	offered [2] - 7:10,	220:18, 223:9,
negotiation [1] - 9:5	nonetheless [1] -	numbers [20] - 14:9,	69:15	224:10, 229:1,
negotiations [1] - 8:3	74:24	21:16, 59:16, 81:24,	offering [1] - 51:4	231:17, 236:1
nest [1] - 235:20	nonexistent [1] -	82:21, 97:3, 97:4,	offers [1] - 67:9	one-day [5] - 20:15,
never [14] - 17:9,	143:15	97:7, 97:8, 97:10,	office [1] - 182:25	20:22, 21:4, 21:7,
51:21, 52:8, 52:19,	nontidal [4] - 65:1,	97:18, 100:4,	official [4] - 34:17,	21:12
56:20, 85:19, 90:20,	176:5, 228:6, 234:22	100:10, 101:11,	62:19, 62:21, 215:21	ones [8] - 131:25,
93:9, 94:6, 95:18,	normal [4] - 17:3,	101:24, 102:6,	officials [4] - 59:18,	133:15, 181:5,
96:5, 97:6, 103:18,	17:4, 50:3, 95:23	149:8, 149:15,	59:24, 62:23, 84:7	198:4, 214:8, 233
233:1	normally [2] - 143:8,	152:21, 203:3	often [2] - 138:9,	233:12, 236:1
evertheless [1] -	224:10	numerous [2] - 57:25,	231:9	ongoing [3] - 26:18
35:14	north [4] - 177:8,	84:18	old [3] - 106:24, 131:9,	58:8, 135:7
lew [1] - 45:15	177:9, 194:18, 225:3		138:13	open [1] - 223:17
1ew [25] - 22:10, 34:1,	northern [3] - 12:19,	0	once [4] - 71:22,	opened [1] - 223:6
35:15, 35:18, 35:20,	12:23, 89:5		74:22, 95:18, 155:19	opening [11] - 7:7,
73:2, 75:23, 75:25,	Northern [3] - 154:17,	oath [5] - 132:13,	one [111] - 10:15,	7:17, 43:4, 46:15,
85:6, 86:9, 86:23,	163:20, 213:4	165:3, 165:9,	16:18, 17:21, 20:15,	46:18, 56:22, 78:2
87:5, 90:11, 100:4,	Northwest [3] - 5:10,	165:21, 166:1	20:22, 21:4, 21:7,	83:17, 88:4, 94:1,
100:9, 100:11,	64:18, 205:17	objective [3] - 12:13,	21:12, 21:15, 22:14,	104:2
100:14, 116:2,	notably [1] - 67:7	14:21, 24:5	25:5, 26:7, 33:10,	operated [2] - 77:4,
140:4, 145:24,	Notary [2] - 1:15,	obligated [1] - 210:5	40:15, 43:11, 45:4,	175:1
153:16, 162:3,	238:2	observations [4] -	45:10, 47:5, 51:15,	operates [3] - 161:1
169:10, 232:22,	note [9] - 57:20,	25:24, 27:2, 228:7,	51:17, 53:24, 58:21,	174:16, 199:21
232:24	61:22, 82:15, 87:12,	228:8	62:25, 65:16, 68:20,	operating [3] - 11:1
next [61] - 9:9, 20:19,	95:17, 134:2,	observed [2] - 118:15,	68:21, 69:10, 73:14,	88:23, 214:17
26:14, 30:10, 32:10,	140:11, 163:19,	144:22	76:7, 76:8, 77:3,	Operating [1] - 214
48:25, 75:18, 95:13,	213:3	obsessive [1] - 76:22	81:9, 90:14, 94:3,	operation [2] - 169:
106:8, 108:9, 109:1,	noted [2] - 140:7,	obtain [1] - 88:13	97:2, 97:9, 98:14,	172:20
109:12, 109:24,	208:23	obviously [1] - 159:13	104:3, 116:8,	operations [37] -
110:12, 110:25,	Noted [7] - 44:8,	occasion [2] - 85:23,	117:24, 118:23,	72:20, 89:1, 89:6,
111:7, 111:12,	44:10, 104:17,	167:14	119:11, 120:6,	89:10, 91:11, 91:
111:19, 112:6,	104:19, 192:25,	occasions [1] - 13:15	120:23, 122:23,	91:21, 92:15,
112:20, 113:10,	193:2, 237:17	occur [6] - 11:20,	125:6, 126:18,	154:22, 156:10,
113:22, 114:6,	notes [3] - 176:9,	66:1, 129:13,	127:4, 127:12,	160:17, 160:24,
114:18, 114:23,	195:13, 238:5	219:24, 221:15,	127:14, 128:1,	161:10, 164:17,
115:3, 115:6,	nothing [7] - 52:4,	226:10	131:25, 133:2,	165:5, 165:22,
115:11, 115:17,	61:8, 70:15, 70:21,	occurred [17] - 14:14,	133:7, 133:10,	166:2, 166:20,
116:7, 116:25,	77:7, 105:6, 116:16	29:2, 42:10, 65:4,	133:20, 134:10,	166:25, 167:6,
127:3, 127:8,	notice [1] - 22:17	66:18, 124:3, 129:1,	138:11, 139:18,	167:12, 167:17,
128:17, 133:16,	November [5] - 159:2,	129:3, 219:16,	140:3, 140:24,	168:13, 168:14,
136:1, 136:21,	191:25, 198:22,	219:22, 219:24,	141:2, 143:25,	169:3, 169:13,
137:8, 139:24,	237:19, 238:11	220:12, 221:7,	146:2, 150:11,	171:17, 173:9,
141:23, 141:24,	nowhere [1] - 95:6	221:12, 222:12,	150:25, 153:24,	199:19, 208:10,
173:6, 173:20,	Number [1] - 2:11	222:13, 226:11	154:25, 157:20,	208:12, 208:14,
176:9, 184:23,	number [30] - 19:8,	occurring [7] - 7:9,	159:24, 160:1,	214:9, 231:4, 231
185:14, 201:23,		23:23, 32:2, 143:8,	163:6, 168:11,	231:8, 232:13
204:9, 206:23,	20:15, 21:14, 28:20, 35:15, 38:1, 48:18	147:17, 148:6,	175:2, 176:8, 176:9,	opinion [14] - 25:10
210:1, 214:20,	35:15, 38:1, 48:18, 85:21, 95:12, 100:8,	219:20	177:1, 179:2, 179:7,	51:19, 67:9, 72:1
215:13, 220:16,	, , ,	occurs [3] - 43:1,	179:11, 181:1,	73:1, 145:24,
230:5, 230:7,	100:12, 100:15, 101:7, 111:9	195:13, 226:16	181:5, 183:19,	146:14, 148:24,
231:17, 231:23	101:7, 111:9, 112:24, 113:8	ocean [1] - 224:11	185:11, 186:23,	152:7, 152:11,
nilly [1] - 130:3	112:24, 113:8, 114:25, 115:20	Ochlockonee [2] -	188:11, 190:17,	193:21, 194:5,
ninth [1] - 48:22	114:25, 115:20,	17:22, 108:12	194:9, 197:22,	195:22, 228:24
noncompliance [1] -	149:14, 149:16, 140:18, 150:22	October [5] - 1:13,	198:2, 198:4,	opinions [2] - 45:2
21:18	149:18, 150:23,	69:12, 105:25,	198:10, 200:15,	93:17
nonconsumptive [1] -	158:9, 158:18,	117:13, 186:12	202:2, 205:11,	opponent [1] - 94:2
82:24	163:20, 174:16,	OF [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:6,	206:13, 207:17,	opportunity [1] -
	179:11, 179:13,	1:9	208:18, 211:13,	129:16
	100.10 010.10		,	17710
nondrought [4] - 10:2,	190:19, 218:12	offer [3] - 51:19.	211:16. 213:16	
	190:19, 218:12 numbered [4] - 110:15, 112:4, THI	offer[3]-51:19, E REPORTING G	211:16, 213:16, ROUP ^{'3, 217:4,}	opposed [1] - 224:1 optimal [1] - 99:8

20:22, 21:4, 21:7, 21:12 ones [8] - 131:25, 133:15, 181:5, 198:4, 214:8, 233:1, 233:12, 236:1 ongoing [3] - 26:18, 58:8, 135:7 open [1] - 223:17 opened [1] - 223:6 opening [11] - 7:7, 7:17, 43:4, 46:15, 46:18, 56:22, 78:25, 83:17, 88:4, 94:1, 104:2 operated [2] - 77:4, 175:1 operates [3] - 161:1, 174:16, 199:21 operating [3] - 11:17, 88:23, 214:17 **Operating** [1] - 214:13 operation [2] - 169:3, 172:20 operations [37] -72:20, 89:1, 89:6, 89:10, 91:11, 91:19, 91:21, 92:15, 154:22, 156:10, 160:17, 160:24, 161:10, 164:17, 165:5, 165:22, 166:2, 166:20, 166:25, 167:6, 167:12, 167:17, 168:13, 168:14, 169:3, 169:13, 171:17, 173:9, 199:19, 208:10, 208:12, 208:14, 214:9, 231:4, 231:5, 231:8, 232:13 opinion [14] - 25:10, 51:19, 67:9, 72:18, 73:1, 145:24, 146:14, 148:24, 152:7, 152:11, 193:21, 194:5, 195:22, 228:24 opinions [2] - 45:25, 93:17 opponent [1] - 94:20 opportunity [1] -129:16 opposed [1] - 224:10 optimal [1] - 99:8

Mason & Lockhart -. age 200 to 200 of 271

r				
options [3] - 94:11,	Oyster [2] - 53:19,	193:24, 196:1,	214:2, 218:23,	107:3, 118:23,
94:18, 94:20	59:23	196:3, 197:17,	223:5, 226:13,	150:23, 180:13,
orange [1] - 126:21	oyster [32] - 25:2,	197:19, 200:3,	230:13, 232:11,	227:15
order [4] - 164:4,	26:1, 26:8, 27:4,	202:5, 204:9, 206:1,	233:15	per [12] - 13:16, 13:17,
184:13, 229:15,	27:18, 28:7, 29:5,	210:17, 214:3,	participate [1] - 201:4	16:17, 16:20, 16:22,
235:20	43:17, 48:19, 53:1,	215:13, 216:9,	participated [2] -	19:9, 26:8, 80:1,
Order [1] - 88:15	53:8, 53:13, 53:24,	225:25	200:25, 205:22	80:6, 80:7, 80:8,
ordered [1] - 46:23	54:9, 54:15, 54:20,	pages [4] - 51:2,	particular [45] - 10:6,	187:10
Oregon [2] - 45:6,	55:10, 55:13, 55:19,	119:22, 119:23,	12:14, 13:3, 14:19,	percent [17] - 10:18,
88:17	55:20, 56:5, 56:10,	238:4	16:12, 16:18, 17:11,	11:6, 48:24, 77:21,
organisms [2] - 61:12,	57:15, 58:9, 58:19,	pain [1] - 77:9	17:17, 18:18, 18:19,	77:22, 80:9, 81:19,
66:10	59:3, 59:9, 59:12,	paper [9] - 53:18,	20:2, 20:8, 21:11,	82:2, 90:5, 97:23,
organizations [1] -	59:14, 60:14, 60:24,	57:17, 57:25, 58:4,	22:3, 22:8, 23:11,	129:4, 166:15,
79:8	68:23	58:25, 65:16,	23:19, 24:21, 24:24,	187:23, 191:8,
orient [3] - 157:3,	oysterman [1] - 26:1	150:19, 151:5,	30:9, 30:11, 34:16,	201:22, 201:24,
158:8, 194:7	oysters [19] - 24:9,	151:20	37:22, 38:6, 40:6,	212:11
Original [3] - 1:1,	24:23, 24:24, 26:4,	paragraph [57] - 53:3,	53:2, 109:4, 109:6,	percentage [2] -
38:17, 39:16	26:6, 26:20, 27:10,	55:24, 119:10,	109:9, 109:14,	76:17, 164:2
original [2] - 153:23,	27:23, 29:8, 29:17,	146:23, 148:9,	109:20, 110:14,	perceptible [1] -
154:6	48:16, 52:24, 52:25,	155:3, 155:4, 155:9,	111:20, 112:14,	103:17
originally [2] - 164:9,	59:16, 60:1, 60:7,	156:5, 159:6, 160:3,	114:15, 115:19,	perception [1] - 58:6
181:19	60:9, 61:2, 61:4	160:4, 160:16,	115:21, 139:7,	perhaps [3] - 100:7,
Orley [1] - 129:11		161:12, 164:15,	155:2, 156:9, 179:2,	107:18, 199:13
otherwise [1] - 139:3	Р	164:16, 165:16,	207:17, 220:23,	peril [1] - 68:7
ourselves [1] - 224:24		166:6, 166:8, 167:2,	226:12, 234:6	period [6] - 29:4, 36:7,
outcome [4] - 41:18,	p.m [5] - 79:18,	167:10, 168:10,	particularly [5] -	37:22, 67:13, 72:2,
90:22, 201:3, 238:8	104:19, 192:25,	169:5, 169:6,	18:22, 20:25, 23:7,	80:14
outdoor [5] - 79:17,	193:2, 237:17	169:11, 171:6,	29:7, 206:6	periodic [1] - 147:24
79:19, 80:18, 80:21,	Page [1] - 2:11	172:3, 172:16,	parties [4] - 15:15,	periods [2] - 66:2,
100:24	page [78] - 18:16,	173:6, 174:14,	38:1, 46:25, 107:13	216:15
outs [1] - 159:12	18:21, 81:11,	174:25, 178:7,	parts [4] - 16:6, 31:13,	permanent [2] - 29:21,
outset [2] - 47:11,	108:24, 109:4,	179:7, 184:2, 184:7,	130:18, 135:25	39:2
88:21	109:6, 109:10,	197:16, 198:24,	party [4] - 41:13,	permission [2] - 4:11,
outstanding [1] - 79:6	109:12, 109:13,	199:10, 200:3,	88:11, 88:22, 94:16	18:8
overall [6] - 55:11,	109:18, 110:9,	200:24, 201:14,	pass [7] - 42:14, 71:1,	permit [3] - 220:3,
60:1, 70:22, 72:23,	111:5, 111:9,	202:5, 202:6,	82:21, 85:8, 90:1,	222:9, 222:18
79:24, 80:2	111:14, 112:3,	202:17, 205:25,	91:2, 119:4	permits [9] - 35:6,
overallocation [1] -	112:4, 112:23,	206:12, 208:19,	passed [1] - 35:17	35:12, 35:15, 41:23,
35:11	113:3, 113:8,	210:16, 211:1,	past [10] - 10:4, 15:6,	85:7, 86:23, 87:5,
overflows [1] - 65:24	114:15, 114:25,	212:4, 212:5, 214:4,	36:19, 53:7, 56:8,	130:13, 134:22
overharvesting [6] -	115:8, 115:9,	216:5, 216:9	60:3, 72:8, 120:7,	permittable [1] - 33:22
27:15, 28:3, 28:8,	115:19, 115:22,	paragraphs [3] -	144:13, 190:24	permitted [3] - 40:20,
28:12, 60:15, 61:1	121:11, 121:17,	164:23, 215:4, 215:7	pat [1] - 5:6	130:2, 143:1
overseeing [1] - 41:2	125:16, 127:8, 137:8, 146:18	parasites [1] - 29:5	pathogens [1] - 29:6	permitting [2] - 18:13,
overstated [1] - 49:12	137:8, 146:18, 148:8, 149:19,	pardon [2] - 130:4,	pattern [2] - 13:5,	86:10
overstatement [1] -	152:11, 152:24,	153:23	236:23	PERRY [66] - 1:17,
85:18	157:5, 157:9,	part [38] - 10:7, 10:23,	patterns [1] - 78:9	3:9, 3:14, 3:17, 3:20,
overuse [1] - 33:23	157.5, 157.9, 158:24, 159:5,	11:1, 40:9, 48:12,	PAUL [1] - 1:19	3:23, 4:2, 4:7, 4:10,
overwhelming [4] -	161:11, 163:18,	48:19, 50:16, 52:15,	Paul [2] - 4:2, 105:12	4:15, 4:21, 4:25, 5:5,
38:19, 75:12, 76:17,	164:15, 165:14,	84:4, 84:17, 99:14,	pause [2] - 81:8, 97:21	5:9, 5:14, 5:22, 7:5,
82:10	167:2, 168:6, 168:9,	119:2, 125:4,	pay [1] - 39:3	7:11, 7:16, 7:24,
overwhelmingly [1] -	168:23, 171:2,	126:11, 126:16,	peak [1] - 76:10	18:15, 25:22, 104:7,
77:10	171:3, 171:4,	129:22, 135:23,	peaks [1] - 10:1	106:14, 106:17,
own [14] - 17:25,	172:15, 173:5,	138:12, 139:9,	peer [1] - 55:3	107:1, 108:9,
19:17, 19:20, 22:6,	174:14, 176:3,	140:24, 142:10,	peer-reviewed [1] -	108:22, 109:1,
28:24, 59:11, 66:23,	176:8, 176:11,	148:24, 154:20,	55:3	109:6, 109:9,
82:22, 89:18, 89:19,	176:16, 178:7,	159:17, 162:25,	pending [4] - 57:2,	109:12, 109:16,
91:5, 99:20, 143:5,	184:23, 185:9,	170:6, 173:4,	57:12, 81:16, 156:9	109:20, 109:24,
		1//16 177.01		440 5 440 0
		177:15, 177:21,	people [9] - 12:4,	110:5, 110:8,
149:15	185:15, 190:19,		people [9] - 12:4, ROUP) , 48:4, 50:14,	110:5, 110:8, 110:12, 110:17,
	185:15, 190:19, 192:2, 193:23, THI		ROUP	

110:25, 111:4,	picture [33] - 12:15,	planning [1] - 15:18	185:22	precedes [1] - 171:16
111:7, 111:12,	13:1, 17:2, 25:9,	plans [1] - 128:10	policies [1] - 86:1	preceding [2] - 59:12,
111:19, 111:23,	25:12, 30:18, 30:23,	plant [1] - 118:20	Policy [1] - 113:14	122:23
112:2, 112:6,	30:25, 54:3, 75:19,	plants [1] - 62:15	policy [6] - 23:13,	precipitated [1] - 53:7
112:14, 112:20,	84:21, 120:19,	play [7] - 33:18,	23:15, 41:22, 43:6,	precipitation [1] -
113:1, 113:6,	122:23, 133:4,	106:18, 107:17,	58:10, 77:6	14:23
113:10, 113:18,	138:7, 138:17,	108:6, 108:19,	politics [1] - 61:6	precise [1] - 167:20
113:22, 114:3,	138:19, 138:20,	132:17, 132:20	pools [1] - 203:2	precisely [2] - 189:12,
114:6, 114:10,	139:1, 139:2, 139:7,	played [45] - 18:14,	population [30] -	226:17
114:13, 114:18,	139:14, 177:4,	25:21, 59:9, 87:10,	10:10, 28:9, 48:3,	preclude [1] - 103:16
114:23, 115:3,	178:6, 178:8,	108:8, 108:21,	49:22, 54:15, 59:10,	precludes [1] - 161:15
115:6, 115:11,	178:15, 178:18,	108:25, 109:5,	61:3, 61:19, 67:10,	predating [1] - 57:23
115:17, 115:24,	178:22, 182:14,	109:8, 109:11,	68:2, 69:18, 70:1,	predators [10] - 24:22,
116:5	216:24, 217:1,	109:15, 109:19,	70:17, 70:22, 71:5,	25:1, 25:7, 25:13,
Perry [12] - 3:10,	217:9, 217:17	109:23, 110:4,	71:13, 72:1, 72:16,	25:14, 26:21, 27:8,
46:14, 47:16, 49:10,	pictured [5] - 48:7,	110:7, 110:11,	72:25, 80:3, 80:14,	29:6
52:24, 65:6, 66:1,	53:20, 68:8, 86:5,	110:16, 110:24,	125:6, 146:7,	predictable [3] -
66:11, 85:15, 87:10,	179:7	111:3, 111:6,	147:15, 147:19,	91:24, 91:25, 92:9
93:6, 103:25	pictures [10] - 25:4,	111:11, 111:18,	147:25, 148:13,	predicting [1] - 70:24
perry [1] - 85:21	26:22, 136:2,	111:22, 112:1,	149:5, 164:5, 214:23	predictions [3] - 51:4,
Perry's [2] - 44:2, 88:4	136:11, 138:4,	112:5, 112:13,	populations [8] -	71:1, 87:8
persist [1] - 20:7	175:14, 175:16,	112:19, 112:25,	57:15, 65:15, 67:12,	predicts [3] - 61:13,
persistent [2] - 36:18,	175:18, 187:22,	113:5, 113:9,	124:22, 135:18,	61:20, 71:17
235:13	236:2	113:17, 113:21,	145:21, 150:3, 172:9	prefiled [8] - 9:19,
person [3] - 25:23,	piece [1] - 77:3	114:2, 114:5, 114:9,	portion [8] - 10:17,	22:12, 23:16, 30:12,
181:14, 238:8	piled [2] - 138:14,	114:12, 114:17,	48:1, 48:3, 48:8,	105:19, 105:23,
personal [2] - 25:24,	228:15	114:22, 115:2,	48:21, 82:10, 82:12,	117:7, 117:12
165:8	piles [1] - 138:7	115:5, 115:10,	221:9	Preliminary [3] -
personnel [2] - 38:11,	pine [8] - 54:23, 55:2,	115:16, 115:23,	portions [1] - 124:11	158:6, 170:8, 170:19
131:5	55:5, 56:1, 57:3,	132:22, 192:3	Portland [1] - 1:13	preliminary [4] -
perspective [3] -	58:5, 58:22, 59:6	playing [2] - 18:8, 107:14	position [15] - 8:21,	157:18, 157:22,
11:23, 37:6, 77:12	Pine [3] - 28:11, 54:2, 54:9	pleasure [1] - 237:16	8:24, 9:4, 27:11,	157:24, 163:10
Perspectives [1] - 110:22	pine's [2] - 56:20,	plummeted [1] - 80:7	52:19, 60:15, 71:2,	premise [1] - 149:13
	58:11	plus [1] - 59:1	103:15, 173:2, 173:14, 173:17,	prepare [2] - 7:13,
persuaded [1] - 85:7 pertains [1] - 109:2	Pine's [2] - 54:7, 58:24	point [40] - 18:24,	174:2, 174:25,	116:8
Peter [2] - 80:6, 90:25	pipe [2] - 131:12,	28:15, 36:15, 46:20,	175:5, 215:25	prepared [10] - 64:15,
Peter [2] - 50:0, 50:25 Ph.D [2] - 51:17, 53:25	224:6	47:5, 52:14, 54:11,	positive [1] - 79:24	80:6, 82:6, 104:8,
Phaneuf [3] - 52:7,	pipes [1] - 80:20	54:12, 69:11, 73:14,	possible [5] - 39:7,	107:3, 107:6, 107:7,
52:10, 81:6	pitches [1] - 52:17	93:25, 95:9, 97:2,	41:8, 76:5, 92:8,	116:2, 116:5, 117:20
Phase [7] - 204:4,	pivot [1] - 17:6	123:14, 125:12,	134:23	present [7] - 9:22,
213:9, 213:11,	pivots [1] - 11:4	130:18, 135:14,	possibly [3] - 51:7,	11:21, 19:22, 46:19, 62:22, 72:12, 142:21
213:14, 213:15,	place [8] - 33:4, 70:12,	135:17, 135:20,	52:21, 77:14	63:23, 73:13, 142:21 Present [1] - 1:25
213:17, 213:18	87:5, 90:19, 97:25,	137:20, 137:21,	potential [2] - 46:4,	presentation [26] -
phenomenon [1] -	107:21, 219:13,	138:3, 142:7, 142:8,	160:17	9:10, 11:12, 33:8,
162:19	220:5	144:11, 144:13,	potentially [5] - 25:12,	37:23, 38:3, 38:6,
Phil [1] - 3:10	placed [1] - 131:15	149:2, 152:10,	25:13, 59:1, 169:2,	38:9, 41:11, 44:2,
Philip [1] - 89:11	places [2] - 31:10,	169:17, 186:21,	169:12	44:5, 49:11, 108:16,
PHILIP [1] - 1:17	190:13	201:9, 202:6,	power [2] - 45:9,	113:12, 121:11,
photo [2] - 123:1,	placing [1] - 74:13	207:16, 224:9,	209:21	125:11, 127:9,
131:9	plain [2] - 15:21,	228:16, 232:19,	PowerPoint [5] -	134:11, 136:12,
photograph [3] -	184:11	233:11, 236:7,	113:12, 120:6,	141:25, 142:11,
24:21, 130:24, 131:4	Plain [1] - 18:3	237:5, 237:9	126:10, 137:8,	143:13, 162:12,
phrase [1] - 231:23	Plaintiff [1] - 1:4	Point [1] - 60:4	162:12	227:1, 229:6,
physical [2] - 62:17,	plan [5] - 15:17, 86:9,	pointer [2] - 24:2,	practicable [1] - 41:12	230:11, 231:15
63:18	130:6, 214:17	220:8	practice [1] - 60:8	presented [2] - 94:17,
phytoplankton [1] -	Plan [5] - 17:22,	pointing [1] - 221:6	practices [1] - 60:22	150:20
29:18	108:12, 114:1,	Points [1] - 111:2	pre [1] - 64:8	presenting [2] - 44:19,
pick [5] - 94:18, 94:20,	114:8, 214:14	points [5] - 33:15,	pre-existing [1] - 64:8	94:22
218:9, 223:11	planned [1] - 233: 'I'H.	E REPORTING G	ROUP lent [1] - 103:4	preserve [3] - 23:21,
1	τv	lagon & Tockha	rt	

83 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

				1
35:2, 42:24	193:25, 197:11,	68:22	pulled [2] - 25:5,	177:24
presiding [1] - 8:15	197:14, 207:20,	proper [1] - 166:13	59:17	questions [16] - 9:11,
press [1] - 37:13	207:22, 213:2,	proportion [1] - 49:20	pumped [1] - 83:23	129:15, 129:16,
pressures [1] - 60:22	213:6, 216:6, 216:8,	proposal [2] - 100:1,	pumping [6] - 16:8,	135:9, 137:6, 147:9,
pretrial [7] - 27:25,	217:2, 217:3, 217:20	109:25	16:10, 17:13, 84:23,	152:12, 152:21,
42:3, 51:3, 78:25,	Primis [6] - 5:24,	proposals [1] - 92:13	86:13	156:14, 168:7,
81:10, 83:16, 89:17	43:23, 43:24, 44:11,	propose [1] - 41:5	punish [1] - 76:4	168:20, 190:17,
pretty [4] - 29:9, 37:7,	104:1, 117:17	proposed [7] - 35:5,	purchased [1] - 23:20	198:18, 217:20,
63:16, 236:15	principal [1] - 16:14	46:5, 73:2, 96:6,	pure [1] - 51:11	218:9, 218:12
prevailed [1] - 60:11	principally [2] - 70:10,	99:10, 118:25,	purple [8] - 67:17,	quick [1] - 236:15
prevent [2] - 125:13,	70:11	119:13	68:13, 68:16,	quickly [5] - 44:20,
131:18	print [1] - 185:25	proposes [1] - 102:7	155:13, 167:5,	51:16, 84:1, 102:11,
prevented [1] - 61:7	printout [1] - 13:3	proposition [5] -	171:20, 172:9, 199:7	234:10
previewed [1] - 56:21	privilege [1] - 44:15	166:13, 171:16,	purpose [3] - 34:19,	quite [4] - 7:12, 22:4,
previous [1] - 158:15	problem [13] - 23:22,	171:23, 172:13,	37:8, 57:8	183:20, 236:14
previously [9] - 69:3,	35:23, 37:4, 37:10,	172:25	purposes [3] - 46:20,	quo [3] - 42:6, 42:7,
69:14, 96:5, 138:22,	39:12, 39:17, 41:25,	prospect [1] - 87:6	63:24, 83:12	42:19
188:10, 188:12,	60:14, 67:5, 68:23,	protect [7] - 23:4,	pursue [1] - 68:15	quote [14] - 53:4,
198:13, 214:7,	91:23, 192:22,	23:14, 43:7, 86:11,	pursues [1] - 23:16	55:21, 57:7, 57:13,
225:19	220:14	159:20, 199:3, 210:5	pushed [1] - 93:19	57:19, 58:4, 68:15,
prey [1] - 24:23	problems [3] - 68:22,	protected [3] - 42:20,	pusiteu [1] = 55.15 put [48] - 11:23, 26:16,	68:18, 82:24, 98:4,
pricing [1] - 79:12	96:4, 142:18	61:4, 171:18	33:10, 45:5, 47:25,	160:16, 169:2,
primarily [7] - 108:10,	procedures [1] - 89:15	protecting [3] - 42:19,	48:23, 49:10, 50:12,	174:16, 214:6
131:10, 218:18,	proceed [4] - 7:4,	73:11, 215:22	50:17, 64:13, 65:6,	quoted [1] - 166:12
219:11, 226:11,	7:24, 118:1, 118:2	protection [1] - 83:12	73:25, 75:9, 85:5,	quotes [1] - 161:1
230:13, 233:13	Proceeding [1] -	Protection [28] - 4:16,	85:21, 89:24, 90:9,	quoting [2] - 148:25,
primary [1] - 36:21	237:18	5:16, 12:1, 15:20,	96:14, 100:11,	166:10
PRIMIS [85] - 1:21,	PROCEEDINGS [2] -	18:11, 32:17, 33:16,	104:8, 119:23,	Qureshi [1] - 3:17
5:23, 6:8, 6:11, 6:14,	1:9, 3:1	34:12, 34:18, 34:20,	120:17, 121:12,	QURESHI [5] - 1:18,
6:16, 6:23, 7:2, 7:21,	Proceedings [1] -	35:17, 35:23, 36:2,	122:17, 125:17,	3:19, 104:22,
43:24, 44:12,	238:6	36:5, 37:5, 37:12,	125:25, 130:10,	105:16, 105:22
104:11, 104:16,	process [4] - 58:15,	37:16, 37:25, 38:11,	130:18, 131:12,	
106:3, 106:6, 116:6,	93:13, 105:17,	38:16, 42:15, 64:20,	131:13, 132:3,	R
117:18, 118:1,	156:13	79:8, 84:11, 85:8,	136:22, 141:2,	IN
118:5, 118:7,	processes [2] - 96:20,	104:25, 108:2,	143:1, 146:19,	Radium [3] - 16:19,
119:19, 120:2,	96:24	111:17	153:7, 153:11,	16:23, 17:2
120:3, 125:21,	produce [1] - 102:16	proud [2] - 47:7, 78:6	155:3, 176:2,	rainfall [1] - 76:10
125:24, 126:4,	produced [7] - 27:6,	prove [3] - 74:19,	176:10, 178:6,	rains [1] - 84:1
125.24, 120.4, 127:5, 127:7, 131:1,	77:24, 90:6, 112:7,	88:20, 102:25	185:15, 189:23,	raise [4] - 105:1,
131:3, 132:7, 132:9,	120:7, 120:8, 143:5	provide [8] - 16:12,	198:19, 216:24,	116:11, 196:6,
		• • • •	217:12, 224:6,	196:16
132:15, 132:20, 132:23, 133:4,	production [1] - 34:21 productive [5] - 84:2,	16:16, 83:10, 105:17, 163:1,	224:13	raised [5] - 88:7, 96:3,
133:6, 136:25,	• • • •	164:7, 218:16,	puts [1] - 103:9	151:19, 152:4,
137:2, 138:5, 138:6,	103:10, 131:25, 132:1, 138:23	229:12	putting [4] - 55:4,	153:19
140:20, 144:25,		provided [5] - 105:24,	87:7, 131:5, 159:12	raises [1] - 190:12
145:2, 146:19,	professor [2] - 54:4, 59:7	117:22, 183:10,	07.7, 101.0, 100.12	RALPH [1] - 1:11
146:21, 157:15,		207:11, 209:13	Q	ran [3] - 89:18, 89:21,
157:16, 159:11,	professors [1] - 28:2 profound [4] - 11:7,	provides [3] - 16:20,	<u> </u>	138:15
159:16, 163:13,	-	94:23, 230:4	qualifies [1] - 176:25	range [8] - 39:7, 40:4,
163:14, 169:16,	14:5, 29:14, 31:21	94.23, 230.4 providing [1] - 208:8	quality [3] - 66:8,	61:25, 69:19,
169:24, 170:1,	program [3] - 40:22,	Public [2] - 1:15,	104:1, 135:15	148:14, 149:4,
170:4, 170:10,	41:1, 179:23		quantify [2] - 52:1,	191:10, 229:12
176:10, 176:12,	programs [1] - 84:18	238:2	144:21	ranging [1] - 145:11
176:23, 177:2,	project [1] - 83:11	public [3] - 23:15,	quantity [1] - 66:8	rare [1] - 94:14
178:11, 178:13,	projection [1] - 7:17	33:8, 84:10	quarter [1] - 187:5	rate [1] - 55:9
179:10, 179:15,	projects [1] - 188:22	publications [2] -	quarters [2] - 221:20,	rates [3] - 10:12, 27:7,
192:4, 192:8,	prominent [2] - 27:25,	62:20, 62:21	221:22	55:10
192:10, 192:17,	33:17	published [9] - 53:17,	questionable [1] -	rather [1] - 38:21
192:24, 193:6,	promote [1] - 78:16	55:2, 57:18, 58:25,	85:3	rationale [1] - 35:20
193:14, 193:15,	prompted [1] - 53:1	62:25, 151:23, E REPORTING G	ROUP oning [1] -	Re [1] - 197:18
100.17, 100.10,	proof [3] - 51:6, 61 $^{ m THI}$	S REFORTING G.		
	Μ	ason & Lockha	irt	
	= =			84 of 93 sheet

- Mason & Lockhart -

			1	
reach [31] - 64:6, 65:1,	recaptured [2] - 225:9,	recross [1] - 157:13	regime [1] - 86:10	remained [1] - 80:12
69:17, 125:4,	228:16	Recross [1] - 2:2	regimes [1] - 166:14	remains [1] - 87:5
126:11, 126:15,	recedes [1] - 31:5	recruitment [5] -	region [10] - 48:24,	remarks [1] - 75:10
126:22, 129:11,	receive [3] - 50:4,	55:10, 55:14,	63:5, 74:12, 78:19,	remedied [1] - 141:6
139:22, 148:13,	93:23, 224:15	147:17, 147:19,	79:2, 79:6, 80:4,	remedies [1] - 95:24
162:16, 176:5,	received [13] - 22:9,	148:6	83:10, 86:10, 96:13	remedy [16] - 39:17,
194:13, 194:16,	22:16, 57:5, 129:4,	REDIRECT [1] - 218:4	Regional [4] - 15:18,	44:22, 45:4, 46:25,
195:1, 202:23,	129:11, 140:15,	redirect [1] - 147:10	17:22, 108:12,	88:21, 94:2, 94:9,
220:14, 220:16,	141:11, 143:9,	Redirect [1] - 2:2	113:25	97:9, 97:21, 97:22,
220:17, 220:23,	143:24, 144:2,	redressed [1] - 50:24	regional [1] - 36:23	98:4, 98:9, 98:13,
220:25, 221:8,	180:2, 204:15,	reduce [5] - 34:22,	regrow [1] - 32:6	98:17, 101:7, 103:3
221:9, 223:12,	220:24	42:15, 89:2, 100:24,	regular [1] - 195:14	remember [11] -
228:6, 233:8, 234:6,	receives [4] - 49:5,	135:14	regulatory [3] - 40:22,	74:14, 83:2, 131:8,
234:8, 234:10,	50:2, 75:12, 76:16	reduced [8] - 53:5,	41:1, 66:23	143:24, 154:23,
234:22, 235:10	recent [7] - 15:4,	56:7, 77:23, 125:6,	Reheis [6] - 32:21,	181:13, 182:23,
reached [3] - 15:22,	31:25, 32:15, 36:17,	135:17, 138:1,	34:25, 84:20, 84:24,	198:4, 198:8,
27:1, 54:13	69:25, 72:19, 93:11	139:19, 216:13	85:16, 111:16	203:20, 217:4
reaches [8] - 188:6,	recently [2] - 148:17,	reduces [1] - 124:22	Reheis's [2] - 85:22,	remembering [1] -
221:8, 221:17,	167:7	reducing [3] - 34:15,	85:25	153:24
226:18, 228:4,	recess [3] - 44:7,	39:21, 87:3	reinstated [1] - 86:23	remote [1] - 46:6
228:5, 233:6, 233:25	104:14, 193:5	reduction [3] - 11:19,	rejects [1] - 47:6	removal [1] - 39:3
reaching [1] - 139:9	Recess [3] - 44:9,	30:21, 206:4	relate [1] - 112:7	remove [1] - 163:2
read [11] - 56:1,	104:18, 193:1	reefs [1] - 60:2	related [4] - 127:16,	removed [1] - 224:19
106:24, 164:22,	rechargeable [1] -	refer [12] - 45:20,	195:2, 213:12,	repeat [1] - 151:25
165:16, 167:9,	83:25	119:15, 132:8,	226:21	repeated [3] - 21:10,
168:7, 188:13,	reclaim [1] - 143:7	163:18, 168:3,	relates [15] - 15:17,	45:16, 63:16
194:4, 195:21,	recognize [9] - 15:13,	168:6, 168:12,	109:3, 109:7,	repeatedly [2] - 45:2,
213:13, 214:24	21:7, 39:10, 40:23,	193:23, 210:13,	110:18, 111:1,	83:8
readily [1] - 12:8	67:17, 120:4,	210:16, 217:23,	111:24, 112:16,	Report [2] - 53:19,
reading [4] - 119:10,	150:18, 188:25	231:9	112:21, 113:11,	59:23
183:24, 188:25,	recognized [2] - 72:7,	reference [4] - 98:1,	114:14, 115:4,	report [17] - 28:15,
215:6	79:7	171:7, 200:7, 215:14	115:18, 115:21,	28:19, 54:13, 64:12,
readings [2] - 12:11,	recognizes [2] -	Referenced [1] - 2:11	161:10, 226:18	64:15, 64:24, 65:9,
151:17	87:20, 87:21	referenced [1] -	relating [1] - 33:1	69:9, 69:24, 70:17,
reads [3] - 40:12,	recollect [2] - 200:23,	182:19	relationship [3] -	95:8, 95:13, 100:22,
74:10, 186:14	203:15	references [1] -	17:12, 55:19, 84:23	101:15, 183:14,
ready [2] - 7:20,	recollection [1] -	182:22	relationships [1] -	184:25, 201:21
104:21	136:16	referred [6] - 113:24,	55:12	reported [8] - 53:22,
real [5] - 8:4, 50:14,	recommendations [1]	124:25, 125:3,	relative [1] - 55:9	55:6, 57:5, 60:8,
67:22, 91:19, 97:16	- 22:7	169:12, 177:3, 184:7	relatively [3] - 16:16,	60:24, 69:12, 69:24,
realize [1] - 68:25	reconfigure [1] -	referring [7] - 43:5,	18:4, 221:13	196:13
realized [3] - 60:12,	225:10	121:23, 154:4,	release [6] - 37:13,	Reporter [1] - 238:16
86:21, 101:5	record [18] - 12:16,	168:14, 181:4,	92:21, 161:2,	reporter [2] - 106:23,
realizes [1] - 70:6	13:1, 14:3, 36:21,	208:15, 212:6	199:23, 209:17,	176:24
really [10] - 27:13,	59:16, 76:9, 78:19,	refers [4] - 145:10,	209:25	reports [4] - 28:14,
29:25, 75:22, 98:15,	99:24, 105:10,	149:21, 155:20,	released [5] - 69:9,	63:13, 87:13, 187:7
124:1, 219:22,	116:20, 146:12,	206:9	69:11, 91:7, 145:24,	representative [1] -
220:16, 221:3,	154:12, 170:4,	refills [1] - 84:1	206:25	30:16
233:22, 236:12	179:12, 192:18,	reflects [1] - 212:1	releases [4] - 76:20,	representatives [1] -
reason [12] - 50:19,	207:25, 213:2, 237:3	reflood [1] - 124:11	89:3, 207:13, 208:8	6:17
63:10, 80:15, 95:2, 00:0, 136:11, 156:8	recorded [1] - 38:14	refresh [2] - 154:25,	relevant [3] - 13:10,	represented [1] -
99:9, 136:11, 156:8, 160:24, 178:22,	recounted [1] - 65:18	215:9	119:7, 177:24	174:15
216:2, 216:4, 233:24	recover [5] - 32:7,	refused [1] - 208:23	relied [2] - 43:16, 54:7	representing [1] -
reasonable [3] -	143:11, 144:7,	regard [1] - 67:19	relief [3] - 88:14,	57:10
16:21, 35:13, 87:6	159:20, 199:3	regarded [1] - 35:1	92:17, 92:24	represents [1] -
reasonably [1] - 22:22	recovering [1] - 144:9	regarding [4] -	relies [1] - 96:22	214:21
reasons [3] - 36:12,	recovery [2] - 195:3,	109:25, 110:5,	relying [3] - 53:15,	reproduce [2] - 27:9,
42:24, 51:9	233:16	160:6, 208:12	63:13, 152:7	164:4
reassessed [1] - 35:12	recreational [2] -	Fedardless 121 - 76·15 E REPORTING G	remain [2] - 55:14,	reptile [1] - 74:6
100000000 [ij = 00.1Z	172:6, 223:15 'L'HE		ROUP	reptiles [1] - 30:6
	M	lason & Tockha	rt	

85 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

Republic [1] - 94:16	90:24	212:23	233:4, 234:25,	228:9, 228:12,
request [8] - 75:23,	response [3] - 66:12,	reviewing [4] -	235:14	228:20, 229:9,
81:16, 93:12, 95:6,	86:2, 182:2	118:24, 119:13,	river [156] - 8:9, 10:17,	229:10, 229:24,
156:11, 182:2,	responses [1] - 119:7	200:25, 201:2	19:6, 19:8, 20:5,	230:25, 232:11,
	-	,	20:10, 20:18, 21:17,	232:14, 232:15,
182:18, 182:22	responsibilities [2] -	revised [1] - 101:7		232:21, 233:6,
requested [4] - 83:11,	108:3, 200:21	rich [1] - 74:11	24:1, 29:2, 29:25,	
94:2, 157:22, 183:1	responsibility [2] -	Rick [2] - 60:17,	30:2, 30:14, 31:9,	233:22, 233:23,
requests [1] - 83:6	9:8, 18:12	186:10	35:2, 36:23, 53:23,	234:2, 234:8,
require [3] - 125:1,	responsible [3] -	right-hand [1] - 136:9	54:15, 54:19, 54:21,	234:19, 234:23,
134:1, 221:1	62:13, 118:24,	rights [3] - 34:6,	58:19, 58:23, 61:11,	236:4, 236:6
required [6] - 28:17,	119:12	35:22, 45:12	62:12, 62:14, 63:7,	River's [1] - 96:17
46:1, 56:16, 131:17,	ResSim [1] - 89:20	Rights [1] - 197:18	63:19, 64:1, 64:4,	river's [1] - 160:25
195:14, 211:3	rest [3] - 87:7, 218:25,	Riparian [4] - 127:13,	64:6, 65:4, 66:22,	riverbank [2] - 137:23,
requirements [6] -	227:23	127:14, 127:20,	67:2, 67:5, 69:17,	139:9
19:18, 19:20, 22:4,	restate [1] - 173:16	128:18	73:10, 73:14, 96:21,	riverbanks [1] - 136:5
33:5, 87:1, 145:12	restoration [4] -	riparian [2] - 127:22,	97:7, 118:15,	riverbed [8] - 64:5,
requires [6] - 45:24,	188:22, 232:13,	130:21	120:22, 123:15,	66:5, 123:7, 123:11,
46:9, 74:21, 124:10,	232:18, 233:16	rise [3] - 3:5, 196:16,	124:6, 124:9,	123:18, 162:15,
124:18, 191:14	restore [2] - 42:5,	230:3	124:11, 124:13,	196:16, 196:18
research [13] - 28:17,	222:25		124:23, 126:6,	riverflows [1] - 84:24
		risen [2] - 196:20,	126:22, 126:25,	riverine [1] - 42:8
54:8, 54:10, 55:1,	restoring [3] - 59:9,	225:17	127:10, 127:16,	
56:20, 69:1, 77:25,	61:5, 215:22	risk [6] - 49:23, 50:12,	127:25, 128:15,	rivers [2] - 16:10,
150:3, 150:7, 153:6,	restrictions [2] -	50:18, 73:18, 74:13,	128:22, 128:23,	166:17
153:11, 180:24	59:16, 97:24	77:10		Rivers [1] - 70:5
Research [1] - 179:22	result [15] - 46:2,	River [94] - 10:17,	129:22, 129:25,	RM [1] - 194:13
researched [3] -	52:12, 53:4, 60:3,	11:19, 12:19, 12:22,	130:3, 130:17,	RMR [2] - 1:14, 238:15
53:14, 59:4, 181:1	66:6, 89:12, 90:18,	13:4, 15:17, 17:15,	130:19, 131:5,	road [1] - 49:1
researcher [2] -	141:12, 142:23,	19:3, 19:10, 19:17,	131:20, 133:24,	Robert [2] - 49:19,
180:22	166:25, 167:6,	19:23, 20:2, 22:16,	135:15, 135:23,	101:22
researchers [2] -	168:13, 188:8,	23:1, 24:7, 29:24,	136:1, 136:3,	rocks [1] - 163:2
58:20, 150:11	189:3, 226:23	30:5, 31:6, 34:1,	136:24, 137:4,	role [4] - 59:9, 88:5,
researching [1] -	resulting [3] - 52:14,	34:11, 34:16, 34:18,	137:7, 137:18,	88:7, 120:11
54:25	164:18, 165:5	34:19, 35:6, 35:11,	137:19, 137:22,	Ron [1] - 59:3
Reservoir [1] - 89:21	results [5] - 14:7,	35:16, 35:19, 35:22,	138:2, 138:12,	root [2] - 229:9,
reservoir [9] - 47:16,	53:18, 84:24, 90:9,	36:1, 36:4, 37:5,	138:14, 139:8,	229:25
	135:7	37:15, 37:16, 42:14,	143:5, 143:9,	
63:3, 88:15, 90:13,		42:21, 44:25, 47:15,	143:10, 145:21,	roots [2] - 229:11,
91:20, 165:21,	resurveyed [1] -		147:3, 148:13,	229:12
166:1, 169:3, 169:13	202:10	55:7, 65:2, 66:19,	150:6, 152:19,	roughly [11] - 91:10,
reservoirs [16] -	retention [1] - 172:5	67:16, 69:4, 71:9,	152:20, 154:23,	129:3, 132:5, 144:1,
76:20, 83:4, 83:9,	retired [2] - 180:19,	72:25, 73:18, 85:8,	160:11, 160:18,	146:2, 150:5,
88:25, 89:3, 89:6,	180:24	85:19, 86:8, 113:15,	162:4, 163:2,	221:24, 222:15,
90:1, 91:22, 92:16,	retreat [1] - 79:3	113:24, 118:12,	164:18, 165:6,	222:21, 222:23,
161:2, 165:11,	return [2] - 66:14,	120:15, 121:3,	165:9, 176:18,	227:1
166:14, 174:23,	82:16	121:7, 121:13,	184:12, 184:19,	row [3] - 14:17, 48:15,
175:1, 199:22,	returned [2] - 82:11,	121:16, 133:17,	184:21, 188:6,	102:1
214:17	82:14	134:20, 135:5,		rows [1] - 109:10
reshelling [1] - 61:6	returns [2] - 82:1, 82:7	137:9, 138:8, 140:1,	189:8, 190:15, 101:5, 104:15	rudimentary [1] - 85:3
reside [1] - 71:8	Reuben [1] - 151:9	141:24, 144:14,	191:5, 194:15,	rule [1] - 192:22
residential [1] - 79:16	revealed [1] - 56:24	160:8, 161:4,	194:20, 194:25,	rules [4] - 80:21,
resolve [1] - 92:13	revealing [1] - 18:22	161:15, 167:19,	196:6, 200:14,	88:23, 89:8, 192:10
resource [6] - 47:9,	revenues [1] - 48:16	168:16, 172:19,	200:15, 201:18,	run [1] - 98:16
49:18, 78:5, 84:8,		172:21, 174:22,	206:15, 218:15,	
84:16, 87:20	reverse [2] - 77:25,	176:3, 177:15,	220:6, 220:20,	running [3] - 44:5,
	125:13	177:17, 181:17,	221:4, 221:14,	53:2, 97:20
resources [5] - 18:13,	review [4] - 57:14,	185:4, 186:19,	221:24, 223:1,	runs [2] - 125:2,
22:6, 23:14, 43:8,	93:11, 119:4, 201:2	199:21, 199:24,	223:2, 223:5, 224:9,	233:14
108:4	reviewed [11] - 55:3,	201:12, 201:18,	225:9, 225:16,	Ryan [1] - 6:18
Resources [3] - 108:1,	57:25, 146:3, 146:4,	205:21, 206:4,	226:10, 226:13,	
115:14	148:19, 157:2,		227:13, 227:16,	S
respect [1] - 40:6	200:13, 201:7,	216:14, 217:22,	007.01 007.00	
respond [2] - 85:25,	212:18, 212:19, $^{ m THI}$	E REPORTING G	ROUP <u>4</u> , 227:22,	sacs [3] - 25:9, 25:10,
	τ./	lason & Lockha	-	
	V	מסטור מ הטכגוה		

26:23	74:16, 94:24, 153:11	25:12, 37:2, 38:22,	Seminole [9] - 11:1,	195:22, 216:13
safe [1] - 33:21	scientist [1] - 58:22	41:8, 48:1, 51:24,	90:12, 90:14, 121:1,	Service-approved [1]
salinities [1] - 26:10	scientists [4] - 53:12,	55:4, 57:1, 64:14,	126:19, 126:24,	- 214:10
salinity [6] - 24:14,	53:15, 53:17, 54:18	69:8, 71:6, 80:5,	134:19, 165:12,	Services [1] - 25:19
26:10, 26:24, 29:3,	Scott [3] - 60:17,	82:12, 92:2, 97:4,	218:24	serving [1] - 65:20
98:3, 98:20	60:21, 116:22	98:1, 98:14, 98:17,	sending [2] - 102:5,	session [1] - 193:8
saltier [1] - 133:25	scours [1] - 162:6	98:24, 99:25, 101:8,	180:9	set [16] - 7:6, 23:20,
saltwater [3] - 24:8,	screen [45] - 7:17,	107:3, 111:14,	sends [1] - 181:10	33:15, 42:20, 94:24,
24:12, 24:23	10:21, 12:10, 14:8,	112:10, 116:24,	senior [1] - 117:2	109:24, 110:25,
sampling [2] - 149:7,	14:20, 15:10, 17:12,	119:17, 120:15,	sense [2] - 52:2, 99:6	111:12, 113:10,
152:15	18:7, 45:7, 47:25,	121:14, 123:16,	sensitivity [1] - 206:3	113:22, 114:6,
sand [53] - 64:9,	51:24, 53:21, 54:3,	125:25, 128:3,	sent [3] - 57:3, 179:16,	114:18, 128:7,
127:17, 128:19,	55:5, 57:1, 64:13,	133:18, 135:3,	179:24	162:2, 197:16,
128:21, 129:20,	68:9, 69:8, 71:6,	137:9, 137:10,	sentence [19] -	217:25
129:24, 130:16,	71:24, 73:25, 84:21,	154:17, 155:4,	164:20, 173:7,	sets [2] - 93:1, 101:23
131:5, 131:11,	85:5, 86:5, 89:24,	155:24, 156:1,	173:20, 183:10,	seven [1] - 8:7
131:14, 131:20,	90:2, 95:21, 96:15,	158:11, 158:19,	184:1, 199:11,	several [9] - 53:7,
131:24, 132:3,	99:25, 100:12,	164:20, 169:16,	200:24, 201:16,	56:8, 69:11, 134:9,
137:23, 138:7,	119:24, 120:19,	170:15, 170:16,	201:23, 206:13,	151:22, 203:3,
138:23, 139:8,	121:7, 121:12,	170:18, 170:24,	206:23, 208:20,	203:4, 212:10,
140:5, 140:13,	125:18, 125:25,	171:6, 171:10,	210:1, 210:4, 212:9,	220:19
143:1, 143:9,	126:6, 137:4, 145:1,	171:20, 172:16,	214:20, 215:19,	severe [8] - 27:24,
143:10, 144:6,	146:20, 155:3,	172:22, 173:12,	216:3	28:4, 33:23, 34:22,
144:12, 144:18,	159:12, 185:16,	174:18, 174:24,	September [3] - 21:3,	34:24, 36:18, 39:5,
189:23, 190:1,	194:1, 216:7	175:21, 179:17,	155:25, 156:3	70:20
190:7, 190:11,	scrutiny [1] - 41:24	181:22, 182:7,	sequence [2] - 28:22,	severely [1] - 29:22
190:22, 191:3,	seashore [1] - 234:12	185:2, 185:6,	29:2	severity [1] - 55:13
191:18, 193:19,	seasonality [1] - 75:16	185:16, 185:17,	series [5] - 25:1,	shad [1] - 134:9
202:21, 203:2,	seated [2] - 105:8,	194:13, 195:5,	32:19, 62:13, 87:2,	shall [6] - 23:13, 43:6,
203:4, 218:25,	116:18	197:19, 204:4,	107:15	105:4, 105:5,
220:19, 224:6,	second [14] - 13:17,	204:11, 204:23,	serious [4] - 41:1,	116:14, 116:15
224:8, 224:13,	16:22, 19:10, 28:19,	205:1, 208:21,	44:23, 45:12, 66:17	shallow [3] - 16:16,
224:18, 224:21,	40:12, 62:2, 112:3,	210:2, 210:14,	servants [1] - 84:10	219:21, 227:19
225:4, 225:8,	148:9, 152:24,	211:6, 211:22, 213:7, 214:4,	serve [4] - 218:18,	shallowly [1] - 211:4
225:10, 227:25,	172:15, 187:11,	213.7, 214.4, 214:10, 215:1,	229:13, 229:18,	Shanahan [2] - 90:25,
228:14, 234:12,	196:3, 199:11,	214:10, 215:1, 215:23, 216:17,	229:19	91:17
236:10	201:15	221:1, 221:6,	served [2] - 84:10,	Shanahan's [1] - 91:5
Sand [6] - 138:9,	secret [1] - 63:2	223:10, 226:2,	95:7	shared [1] - 44:1
138:21, 177:4,	secretary [2] - 4:15,	229:2, 230:5, 230:8,	Service [44] - 35:9,	shelter [1] - 229:12
177:6, 177:9, 220:22	105:23	230:12, 231:20,	63:14, 64:22, 69:2,	shift [2] - 153:15,
sandbar [3] - 224:7,	Secretary [5] - 4:17,	231:22, 231:24,	69:10, 69:12, 69:24,	175:7
224:8, 224:11	23:5, 23:16, 104:24,	235:7	72:4, 72:7, 72:17,	shoals [1] - 136:8
sandy [1] - 235:20	105:18	seeing [7] - 39:13,	72:22, 119:8,	short [2] - 19:11,
sat [1] - 84:7	Section [1] - 23:12	58:13, 225:14,	134:15, 145:23,	19:17
satisfied [1] - 74:24	section [5] - 126:17,	227:12, 227:20,	146:6, 146:25,	shorter [1] - 66:2
save [1] - 43:19	137:7, 137:19, 155:16, 191:14	235:3, 235:24	147:12, 147:14,	shortfall [1] - 19:5
saved [1] - 40:10	155:16, 181:14	seek [1] - 83:4	147:21, 147:23,	show [28] - 10:24,
saw [3] - 26:22, 56:20, 166:24	sections [1] - 194:8	seeking [2] - 49:24,	148:18, 149:21, 150:11, 150:13	28:5, 32:10, 37:21,
	sector [4] - 46:17,	60:17	150:11, 150:13, 151:1, 152:14	41:11, 49:13, 51:6,
scenario [4] - 97:21, 97:22, 98:5, 98:7	47:10, 87:23, 99:14 sediment [2] - 196:10,	seeks [4] - 44:23,	151:1, 152:14, 159:20, 173:8,	59:19, 63:13, 70:14,
scenarios [1] - 97:9	196:15	68:5, 93:23, 94:25	173:24, 173:25,	71:24, 75:17, 77:12,
scenic [1] - 23:14	sedimentation [1] -	seem [1] - 38:18	173.24, 173.25, 180:11, 194:25,	80:11, 82:6, 82:8,
scholars [1] - 16:5	136:10	seemingly [1] - 147:15	195:17, 195:24,	85:22, 87:15, 87:16,
Science [2] - 59:8,	sediments [2] - 162:6,	sees [1] - 56:23	196:13, 199:2,	90:2, 91:5, 95:21,
113:14	162:8	segments [1] - 126:7	214:5, 214:6,	102:24, 122:17,
science [5] - 54:1,	see [104] - 9:17, 10:21,	seized [1] - 196:21	214:10, 215:15,	138:17, 178:23, 101:21, 220:0
85:11, 86:6, 90:23,	10:22, 11:18, 11:20,	select [1] - 41:16	215:17, 215:20,	191:21, 220:9
102:14	13:11, 14:2, 14:9,	selected [1] - 166:16	233:15, 235:5	showed [3] - 70:18, 85:15, 229:2
scientific [4] - 55:3,	15:5, 17:13, 24:1 TH	REPORTING G	ROUP e's [3] - 149:10,	
				showing [4] - 58:17,

Mason & Lockhart

75:10, 122:23, 123:6	Singarella [1] - 4:2	70:20, 139:12,	216:7, 217:2	135:11, 172:8
shown [8] - 11:5, 14:7,	single [4] - 70:11,	184:13, 187:3,	snails [1] - 25:3	Special [2] - 44:12,
45:7, 49:6, 49:8,	70:19, 97:3, 97:13	187:21, 190:15,	so-called [1] - 98:16	44:17
59:21, 79:5, 186:13	sinuosity [2] - 221:4,	190:25, 202:22,	society's [1] - 45:22	SPECIAL [60] - 1:11,
shows [28] - 9:17,	234:14	209:11	solemnly [2] - 105:3,	3:2, 3:13, 3:16, 3:18,
9:24, 13:4, 14:20,	sit [1] - 85:4	Slough [76] - 70:14,	116:13	3:21, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8,
20:1, 21:18, 22:15,	site [8] - 131:15,	70:16, 129:11,	Solicitor [2] - 4:22,	4:14, 4:20, 4:24, 5:4,
24:4, 32:1, 32:8,	138:10, 143:25,	175:8, 175:9,	6:23	5:8, 5:13, 5:20, 6:6,
34:14, 35:25, 49:4,	, ,	175:11, 175:14,		6:10, 6:13, 6:22, 7:1,
49:14, 75:12, 75:18,	144:1, 144:6, 144:9,	175:16, 175:18,	solution [1] - 43:1	7:3, 7:8, 7:15, 7:23,
76:2, 77:16, 100:19,	220:18	175:21, 175:25,	solutions [5] - 39:7,	43:21, 44:6, 44:11,
101:2, 121:19,	sites [5] - 143:2,	176:4, 176:18,	39:11, 39:13, 39:18,	103:24, 104:10,
131:4, 136:2, 136:5,	143:4, 143:23,	177:6, 177:11,	41:8	104:13, 104:20,
138:7, 139:2, 190:20	200:17, 202:10	178:3, 178:9,	someone [4] - 150:7,	105:20, 106:5,
	sits [5] - 90:14,	178:15, 178:24,	180:3, 180:9, 186:3	106:9, 106:12,
shrinking [1] - 71:14	120:24, 121:1,	182:6, 183:19,	sometimes [2] - 25:2,	106:15, 106:20,
shrunk [1] - 77:20	121:24, 126:18	184:3, 184:9,	130:16	
side [19] - 48:6, 48:7,	sitting [2] - 3:6, 75:14	184:20, 185:6,	somewhere [2] -	116:4, 117:8, 117:17, 117:25
51:22, 63:22, 74:16,	Situation [1] - 53:19	185:20, 186:16,	142:25, 220:1	117:17, 117:25, 118:4, 120:1
77:13, 78:21, 87:9,	situation [1] - 46:7	186:20, 186:16, 186:20, 187:9,	soon [1] - 34:2	118:4, 120:1, 125:23, 132:10
97:4, 97:14, 99:18,	six [7] - 14:4, 54:17,	187:18, 188:2,	sooner [1] - 15:23	125:23, 132:19, 156:23, 157:10
120:22, 121:25,	58:25, 187:13,	188:11, 189:1,	sorry [25] - 106:5,	156:23, 157:10, 160:20, 102:6
129:25, 130:17,	187:23, 187:25,	189:7, 189:14,	140:20, 151:25,	169:20, 192:6, 192:9, 192:13,
130:19, 131:6,	191:7	189:17, 189:14, 189:17, 189:20,	156:23, 156:25,	, ,
138:8, 144:13	size [11] - 23:10, 48:2,		169:8, 169:9,	192:21, 193:3,
sides [1] - 234:2	48:9, 49:21, 59:15,	189:24, 190:1,	170:17, 171:3,	193:12, 207:21,
signature [2] - 158:25,	59:25, 69:18, 70:3,	190:8, 190:11,	176:23, 192:4,	218:1, 237:6,
192:2	135:15, 144:12,	191:4, 191:20, 102:10, 105:11	196:3, 196:19,	237:11, 237:14
signed [6] - 159:2,	148:14	193:19, 195:11, 105:12, 105:10	196:21, 197:21,	Species [5] - 141:24,
191:22, 191:25,	skeptical [1] - 95:3	195:13, 195:19, 195:24, 196:14,	201:22, 205:7,	159:21, 199:4,
193:17, 198:13,	skip [1] - 206:12	195.24, 190.14, 196:23, 200:11,	205:8, 209:5,	203:24, 213:24
203:17	slabshell [3] - 67:18,	200:15, 200:22,	210:20, 213:4,	species [78] - 20:7,
significant [27] - 8:4,	68:14, 68:17	200.15, 200.22, 201:19, 202:7,	224:2, 237:6, 237:14	24:10, 24:16, 24:25,
11:18, 16:8, 19:16,	slide [42] - 17:11,	201:19, 202:17, 202:15,	sort [2] - 223:22,	29:16, 29:17, 30:3,
31:25, 41:19, 44:21,	20:19, 22:3, 23:11,	202:23, 206:14,	225:12	30:16, 30:18, 62:4,
50:18, 77:8, 78:14,	24:13, 28:21, 30:11,	208:21, 209:2,	sorts [6] - 24:9, 30:6,	62:6, 62:24, 63:15, 63:18, 63:21, 65:8,
79:23, 93:8, 96:20,	40:11, 75:18,	209:7, 209:9,	30:17, 31:13, 41:8,	
96:23, 102:4,	110:14, 121:11,	209:18, 211:3,	41:16	65:11, 67:5, 67:20,
136:17, 142:15,	121:13, 124:12,	212:12, 213:25,	sought [1] - 92:17	67:25, 68:3, 68:8,
148:22, 149:6,	127:3, 127:4,	212:12, 215:23, 214:24, 215:21,	sound [2] - 85:11,	70:23, 72:24, 73:17,
164:18, 165:6,	127:19, 133:16,	216:16, 216:22,	86:6	74:1, 74:4, 74:6, 74:8, 83:13, 97:7,
186:24, 189:8,	136:1, 136:5, 136:7,	217:7, 217:16,	sounds [2] - 104:16,	
189:13, 189:15,	136:9, 136:21,	221:12, 221:19,	145:14	98:23, 118:12,
189:21, 197:6	137:9, 138:4,	221.12, 221.19, 225:4	south [10] - 125:8,	118:21, 124:22, 124:25, 125:6
significantly [3] -	138:18, 139:16,	sloughs [7] - 30:1,	126:19, 129:8,	124:25, 125:6, 134:10, 140:4
10:3, 24:2, 81:13	139:24, 139:25,	• • • •	129:10, 136:13,	134:10, 140:4, 142:15, 143:7
signing [1] - 93:17	141:23, 141:24,	31:1, 31:8, 65:25, 118:16, 140:11	176:21, 176:22,	142:15, 143:7, 145:3, 145:7
sill [10] - 182:5, 184:8,	142:19, 176:10,	small [4] - 49:17,	177:6, 221:12,	145:3, 145:7, 145:16, 154:22
184:11, 187:1,	225:25, 226:4,	76:11, 82:12, 164:8	233:20	145:16, 154:22, 150:20, 150:24
187:6, 190:16,	226:12, 228:25,		southern [4] - 19:2,	159:20, 159:24, 160:1, 160:7
190:21, 190:22,	229:5, 229:7,	Smit [12] - 149:21,	19:3, 84:17	160:1, 160:7, 162:10, 165:22
190:24, 191:1	231:15, 231:16,	149:24, 150:19, 151:5, 151:9	southwest [4] - 33:8,	162:19, 165:23, 166:2, 166:16
similarly [1] - 40:3	232:4	151:5, 151:9, 151:20, 152:1	50:16, 83:18, 99:14	166:2, 166:16, 160:4, 160:14
simple [1] - 58:18	slides [7] - 107:6,	151:20, 152:1,	sovereign [1] - 102:20	169:4, 169:14,
simplistically [1] -	107:15, 141:1,	152:7, 152:16, 152:17, 152:0	soybeans [1] - 48:15	171:17, 171:25,
184:15	230:5, 230:6, 230:7,	152:17, 153:9, 153:13	space [1] - 138:15	181:14, 198:9, 100:3, 100:6
simply [3] - 42:24,	236:1	153:13 Smit's K1 150:12	spawn [5] - 133:25,	199:3, 199:6, 202:14, 207:14
61:22, 92:8	slightly [2] - 77:11,	Smit's [1] - 150:13	134:1, 136:8,	203:14, 207:14,
Simulation [1] - 89:21	80:13	Smith [7] - 119:23,	161:19, 235:18	208:10, 208:13, 211:1, 213:12
SINGARELLA [2] -	sloping [1] - 225:5	131:2, 132:20,	spawning [4] -	211:1, 213:12, 213:18, 214:22
1:19, 4:4	slough [10] - 31:14 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP <u>21, 134:2</u> ,	213:18, 214:22, 229:13, 229:14,
		8	1	223.13, 228.14,
	IV.	lason & Lockha		88 of 93 shee

-				
229:16, 229:18,	52:25, 75:2, 78:18,	161:9, 182:24,	76:11, 93:21,	studies [6] - 17:21,
229:20, 230:1,	103:20, 104:5,	199:16, 206:2,	100:15, 101:8,	26:15, 68:3, 87:2,
234:5, 235:9, 236:16	190:24, 205:6,	208:7, 209:16	103:8, 103:12,	143:5, 223:19
species' [2] - 145:12,	205:8, 221:3, 229:9,	statements [3] -	113:6, 127:9,	study [15] - 18:17,
148:1	229:21, 229:22,	38:15, 81:10, 104:2	140:17, 145:17,	18:19, 36:11, 67:24,
specific [8] - 9:11,	235:16, 235:17	states [10] - 60:25,	152:6, 155:5, 174:6,	68:24, 73:22, 83:6,
10:23, 23:22,	started [6] - 143:10,	102:20, 108:18,	194:7, 195:18,	85:11, 86:6, 86:8,
119:22, 130:2,	143:11, 144:7,	170:20, 172:4,	225:20, 232:20,	115:12, 115:13,
130:9, 164:1, 206:7	153:25, 219:25,	172:18, 198:15,	232:24	149:21, 182:19,
specifically [3] -	230:17	206:24, 207:1, 215:4	stocks [1] - 59:24	206:18
171:17, 173:6,	starting [12] - 130:4,	STATES [1] - 1:1	stop [1] - 169:1	Study [2] - 181:16,
205:25	143:7, 146:23,	States [10] - 8:24,	stopped [1] - 222:19	205:23
specified [1] - 93:7	168:9, 228:19,	41:14, 64:11, 84:4,	storage [3] - 90:15,	studying [1] - 118:11
speculation [4] - 9:1,	230:12, 232:22,	93:14, 151:1,	90:16, 207:3	stunning [1] - 68:4
46:10, 50:21, 51:11	234:10, 234:13,	154:15, 175:20,	stored [1] - 88:24	sturgeon [26] - 63:11,
speculative [4] - 46:6,	234:14, 234:24,	180:6, 216:11	stores [1] - 89:25	64:3, 72:1, 72:16,
52:22, 61:16, 103:2	235:6	stating [1] - 166:23	storing [1] - 89:5	73:4, 73:7, 73:13,
	starts [7] - 24:11,		_	
spell [3] - 105:10,		status [8] - 42:6, 42:7,	story [2] - 100:18,	125:8, 134:9,
105:13, 116:19	173:7, 205:11,	42:19, 72:23, 72:24,	142:10	134:24, 135:2,
spelling [1] - 177:1	231:22, 234:9,	145:20, 148:1,	straight [4] - 56:6,	135:12, 136:8,
spend [3] - 20:12,	234:23, 235:10	201:12	221:2, 228:11,	142:3, 142:4,
38:8, 83:19	STATE [2] - 1:3, 1:6	statutes [1] - 27:19	228:12	153:18, 155:15,
spends [1] - 83:15	state [35] - 11:14,	Stavins [2] - 49:19,	straightaway [1] -	161:11, 161:16,
spent [5] - 46:14,	23:13, 34:4, 45:11,	101:23	236:7	161:18, 163:3,
75:1, 118:11, 150:5,	47:10, 49:5, 49:15,	stay [3] - 129:14,	straightened [1] -	165:24, 171:19,
180:23	50:16, 55:11, 59:24,	177:25, 224:19	138:12	172:8, 173:8, 233:16
spike [1] - 91:11	63:3, 63:25, 64:25,	steady [1] - 50:4	stranded [2] - 30:23,	sturgeon's [4] - 72:10,
spoil [3] - 223:23,	75:11, 77:2, 84:17,	steep [2] - 234:2,	178:15	72:13, 162:25, 164:3
224:3, 224:23	87:18, 89:5, 90:6,	235:19	stranding [2] - 31:11,	subject [3] - 107:22,
sponsored [1] - 69:1	91:8, 91:9, 93:3,	stenographic [1] -	195:5	111:9, 114:15
-	93:24, 94:16, 99:15,	238:5		sublegal [4] - 59:25,
Spring [2] - 10:23,	102:18, 105:9,		strategy [2] - 78:1,	60:7, 60:9, 61:2
14:11	116:19, 119:7,	step [14] - 12:20,	215:22	
Spring [2] = 17611				
spring [2] - 125:1,		19:25, 42:14, 50:24,	stream [3] - 76:23,	submission [3] -
233:13	119:12, 153:21,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2,	177:21, 177:22	208:7, 212:6, 216:11
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] -
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] -
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] -	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] -	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] -
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] -
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] -	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] -	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19 structure [2] - 19:22,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19, 217:13, 220:2,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6, 87:19, 87:20	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19 structure [2] - 19:22,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17, 31:13
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7, 44:15, 99:4, 192:12,	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19, 217:13, 220:2, 222:8, 231:6, 238:3	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6, 87:19, 87:20 stick [1] - 191:20	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19 structure [2] - 19:22, 229:25	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17, 31:13 suffered [1] - 10:18
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7, 44:15, 99:4, 192:12, 220:9, 220:10	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19, 217:13, 220:2, 222:8, 231:6, 238:3 State's [1] - 130:13	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6, 87:19, 87:20 stick [1] - 191:20 sticking [3] - 156:20,	$\begin{array}{l} 177:21,\ 177:22\\ \textbf{streambed}\ [1]\ -\ 196:7\\ \textbf{streamflow}\ [13]\ -\ 16:9,\\ 36:22,\ 76:25,\ 77:20,\\ 77:23,\ 80:25,\ 87:4,\\ 89:13,\ 94:18,\\ 100:25,\ 101:11,\\ 101:17,\ 101:19\\ \textbf{streamflows}\ [3]\ -\\ 77:17,\ 86:13,\ 101:15\\ \textbf{streamflows}\ [3]\ -\\ 77:17,\ 86:13,\ 101:15\\ \textbf{streamflows}\ [3]\ -\\ 234:16,\ 234:18\\ \textbf{Street}\ [1]\ -\ 11:2\\ \textbf{stressed}\ [1]\ -\ 61:3\\ \textbf{strict}\ [1]\ -\ 80:20\\ \textbf{strictly}\ [1]\ -\ 136:16\\ \textbf{striking}\ [1]\ -\ 80:10\\ \textbf{striped}\ [3]\ -\ 134:9,\\ 142:4,\ 233:19\\ \textbf{structure}\ [2]\ -\ 19:22,\\ 229:25\\ \textbf{structures}\ [1]\ -\ 229:9\\ \end{array}$	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17, 31:13
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7, 44:15, 99:4, 192:12, 220:9, 220:10 standard [1] - 51:8 standing [1] - 59:24	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19, 217:13, 220:2, 222:8, 231:6, 238:3 State's [1] - 130:13 statement [13] - 7:7,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6, 87:19, 87:20 stick [1] - 191:20	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19 structure [2] - 19:22, 229:25 structures [1] - 229:9 Struhs [1] - 20:13	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17, 31:13 suffered [1] - 10:18
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7, 44:15, 99:4, 192:12, 220:9, 220:10 standard [1] - 51:8 standing [1] - 59:24 stands [1] - 89:20	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19, 217:13, 220:2, 222:8, 231:6, 238:3 State's [1] - 130:13 statement [13] - 7:7, 56:5, 56:17, 66:14,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6, 87:19, 87:20 stick [1] - 191:20 sticking [3] - 156:20, 157:1, 166:5 still [22] - 26:18,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19 structure [2] - 19:22, 229:25 structures [1] - 229:9 Struhs [1] - 20:13 student [2] - 149:24, 149:25	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17, 31:13 sufficient [3] - 62:8,
233:13 Springs [3] - 16:19, 16:23, 17:2 springtime [1] - 134:17 squandered [1] - 84:8 stability [1] - 152:22 stabilize [1] - 229:17 stable [10] - 68:1, 70:2, 71:5, 72:24, 73:1, 145:17, 146:7, 148:2, 228:17, 228:20 staff [5] - 57:22, 58:1, 58:4, 182:4, 199:2 stage [3] - 164:19, 165:6, 197:17 stake [3] - 47:12, 47:19 stand [6] - 44:7, 44:15, 99:4, 192:12, 220:9, 220:10 standard [1] - 51:8 standing [1] - 59:24	119:12, 153:21, 160:4, 163:6, 199:11, 230:17 State [47] - 1:15, 1:17, 1:21, 4:12, 5:25, 6:17, 8:16, 11:13, 33:9, 36:11, 41:21, 43:7, 43:25, 57:22, 57:24, 58:7, 62:22, 108:17, 116:25, 117:4, 118:9, 130:8, 131:22, 134:12, 135:2, 142:22, 145:15, 148:16, 154:13, 156:4, 181:8, 197:18, 201:6, 203:12, 204:1, 211:11, 211:23, 212:5, 214:21, 215:19, 216:12, 216:19, 217:13, 220:2, 222:8, 231:6, 238:3 State's [1] - 130:13 statement [13] - 7:7,	51:1, 58:4, 59:2, 75:6, 76:7, 106:9, 116:8, 179:5, 186:13, 187:7 stepping [1] - 122:5 steps [5] - 38:21, 61:8, 81:13, 84:15, 86:16 STEVERSON [1] - 4:18 Steverson [7] - 2:3, 4:17, 104:23, 105:12, 105:18, 106:4, 106:7 Steverson's [2] - 23:6, 23:16 steward [3] - 47:7, 79:6, 103:9 Stewardship [1] - 79:16 stewardship [5] - 47:8, 78:5, 78:6, 87:19, 87:20 stick [1] - 191:20 sticking [3] - 156:20, 157:1, 166:5 still [22] - 26:18,	177:21, 177:22 streambed [1] - 196:7 streamflow [13] - 16:9, 36:22, 76:25, 77:20, 77:23, 80:25, 87:4, 89:13, 94:18, 100:25, 101:11, 101:17, 101:19 streamflows [3] - 77:17, 86:13, 101:15 streams [3] - 234:15, 234:16, 234:18 Street [1] - 1:12 stressed [1] - 61:3 strict [1] - 80:20 strictly [1] - 136:16 striking [1] - 80:10 striped [3] - 134:9, 142:4, 233:19 structure [2] - 19:22, 229:25 structures [1] - 229:9 Struhs [1] - 20:13 student [2] - 149:24,	208:7, 212:6, 216:11 submissions [1] - 203:22 submit [1] - 100:4 submitted [14] - 96:25, 160:15, 161:13, 163:9, 163:21, 166:23, 171:22, 175:20, 182:15, 189:6, 189:10, 190:2, 206:2, 207:10 subscribe [1] - 238:10 substantially [2] - 60:2, 228:10 substantive [1] - 155:16 sucking [1] - 224:5 suddenly [1] - 95:12 sue [1] - 66:25 suffer [2] - 24:17, 31:13 sufficient [3] - 62:8, 83:9, 93:5

89 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

				,
60:1, 81:17	166:19, 168:25,	Swift [73] - 70:13,	188:22, 188:24,	162:2, 221:8
suggested [3] - 95:11,	170:13, 170:21,	70:16, 175:8, 175:9,	207:9, 224:19,	terrible [3] - 36:1,
95:19, 152:17	171:23, 172:5,	175:11, 175:14,	224:22, 225:7,	36:4, 216:25
suggestion [2] - 47:6,	172:8, 172:12,	175:16, 175:18,	230:24, 231:1,	tested [1] - 97:6
73:21	174:2, 204:10,	175:21, 175:25,	233:2, 233:4, 236:5	testified [10] - 68:15,
suggests [2] - 73:16,	210:24, 211:11	176:4, 176:18,	systematic [1] - 27:9	82:23, 96:13, 99:22,
80:17	supporting [2] -	177:6, 177:11,	systems [2] - 8:9,	132:13, 138:21,
suing [3] - 92:19,	22:12, 170:23	178:3, 178:9,	11:17	145:4, 145:7,
96:9, 154:4	supports [2] - 38:6,	178:15, 178:24,		145:16, 189:12
suit [1] - 45:11	47:19	182:5, 183:19,	Т	testify [12] - 25:16,
suitable [2] - 69:13,	supposed [3] - 31:17,	184:3, 184:8,		25:23, 32:22, 34:25,
148:4	58:16, 61:24	184:20, 185:6,	tab [30] - 119:15,	49:20, 52:12, 61:24,
suite [1] - 230:25	suppositions [1] -	185:19, 186:16,	146:10, 150:17,	63:1, 84:15, 87:25,
summary [4] - 38:13,	45:24	186:20, 187:9,	154:11, 158:3,	91:1, 92:7
203:13, 203:23,	Supreme [15] - 8:20,	187:18, 188:2,	170:3, 170:5,	testimony [70] - 23:6,
210:8	45:2, 46:22, 50:10,	188:11, 189:1,	170:15, 170:18,	30:12, 31:23, 52:13,
Summary [2] - 204:3,	50:20, 57:12, 58:16,	189:7, 189:14,	179:9, 191:23,	58:12, 58:14, 61:15,
213:8	69:6, 74:18, 88:16,	189:17, 189:20,	193:21, 197:12,	61:25, 62:4, 62:22,
summed [1] - 91:23	94:17, 102:17,	189:24, 190:1,	197:13, 197:23,	67:23, 70:9, 71:10,
summer [5] - 14:14,	103:4, 103:18,	190:8, 190:11,	197:24, 197:25,	74:11, 74:17, 75:25,
201:16, 201:25,	175:21	191:4, 191:20,	199:11, 204:1,	80:11, 91:15, 98:2,
211:2, 212:13	SUPREME [1] - 1:1	193:19, 195:11,	204:9, 204:21,	98:6, 105:3, 105:24,
summers [1] - 78:13	surgeon [6] - 54:8,	195:13, 195:18,	205:6, 205:7, 205:8,	107:9, 107:17,
Sunding [20] - 39:20,	71:20, 73:12, 134:8,	195:24, 196:14,	208:18, 210:7,	107:23, 107:24,
41:4, 51:21, 82:23,	155:13, 162:23	196:23, 200:11,	213:1, 213:3, 225:23	108:18, 109:17,
94:11, 95:7, 95:15,	surprised [2] - 153:2,	200:15, 200:21,	table [10] - 3:12,	110:5, 110:9,
95:18, 95:21, 96:5,	236:15	201:19, 202:7,	109:7, 109:14,	112:15, 113:19,
97:10, 97:17, 98:10,	surprising [1] - 81:9	202:12, 202:15,	109:18, 115:22,	114:10, 116:13,
99:19, 100:15,	surround [1] - 23:2	202:23, 206:14,	126:2, 152:24, 185:14, 185:17	117:7, 117:12,
100:22, 101:2,	survey [12] - 66:4,	208:21, 209:2,	185:14, 185:17, 193:7	117:14, 119:11,
101:5, 101:18, 102:7	182:9, 183:1, 183:3,	209:6, 209:9,		125:5, 125:17,
Sunding's [6] - 75:24,	183:5, 183:11,	209:18, 211:3,	tabs [1] - 203:21 tagging [2] - 200:17,	125:19, 126:1,
95:13, 97:2, 99:10,	184:2, 184:7,	212:12, 213:25,	236:4	136:22, 149:12,
100:1, 101:11	184:18, 187:8,	214:23, 215:21,	talks [1] - 23:17	160:15, 160:23,
supercharged [1] -	200:21, 211:16	216:16, 216:22,	Tallahassee [1] -	161:6, 161:13,
100:14	Survey [3] - 12:12,	217:7, 217:15, 225:3	57:10	166:23, 168:8,
supervised [2] -	64:11, 180:6	swim [2] - 133:24,	tape [1] - 29:10	169:12, 172:1,
150:7, 150:9	surveyed [1] - 182:5	161:18	Teague [1] - 6:19	175:12, 176:4,
supervising [2] -	surveys [3] - 183:18,	switch [1] - 44:3	TEAGUE [1] - 6:21	176:14, 178:7,
212:16, 212:17	200:13, 200:14	sword [1] - 88:19	team [6] - 53:11,	178:23, 179:8,
supervisor [1] -	survive [2] - 145:13,	swore [1] - 199:17	53:22, 53:25, 54:9,	182:15, 188:13,
212:20	236:20	Sworn [1] - 158:4	57:10, 202:8	189:1, 189:7, 180:10, 100:2
supplemental [1] -	susceptible [1] -	sworn [22] - 62:22,	technical [5] - 8:6,	189:10, 190:3, 101:3, 105:21
208:1	234:4	96:13, 157:23,	38:3, 38:4, 93:13,	191:3, 195:21, 200:1, 216:25
Supplemental [1] -	suspect [2] - 83:19,	159:5, 160:15, 160:22, 161:6	107:2	200:1, 216:25, 217:24
154:14	92:5	160:23, 161:6, 161:9, 161:13	technology [1] - 82:18	text [1] - 111:21
supplements [1] -	suspected [1] -	161:9, 161:13, 166:23, 168:25,	Ted [2] - 117:1, 182:2	THE [13] - 11:1, 105:1,
76:19	148:23	169:12, 190:2,	temperatures [1] -	105:7, 105:8,
Supplies [1] - 110:21	sustain [2] - 62:8,	191:2, 198:25,	14:25	105:11, 106:11,
supply [7] - 81:16,	96:19	199:25, 201:15,	temporarily [1] - 39:4	116:11, 116:17,
83:11, 87:3, 93:12,	sustainability [3] -	202:20, 203:1,	tens [1] - 16:17	116:18, 116:21,
207:4, 213:17,	19:6, 19:18, 110:2	206:2, 208:7, 209:16	tenure [2] - 85:6,	220:10, 233:10,
233:18	sustainable [1] -	synthesize [1] - 119:6	86:14	237:16
Support [5] - 158:5,	87:13	system [24] - 47:16,	tenured [1] - 54:3	Theodore [2] - 2:6,
170:8, 170:19,	Sustainable [1] -	72:25, 75:8, 77:4,	term [8] - 39:11,	116:21
204:3, 213:8	110:21	82:3, 82:9, 88:15,	39:12, 144:24,	theory [1] - 68:6
support [20] - 56:17,	sustaining [1] -	91:12, 134:17,	196:5, 200:17,	thereafter [1] - 38:5
67:6, 73:21, 74:17,	147:20	134:19, 143:2,	223:23, 236:4, 237:1	therefore [1] - 143:12
85:13, 85:18,	swear [2] - 105:3,		ROUP ^[3] - 80:17,	thesis [1] - 150:2
157:24, 163:10,	116:13 TH	E REPORTING G	NUUP	
			-	

		1		
thinks [1] - 42:4	211:23	65:14	Tuesday [1] - 237:18	unambiguous [2] -
Third [1] - 154:13	titled [5] - 111:1,	trees [6] - 31:19, 32:4,	tupelo [4] - 31:19,	12:6, 15:21
third [4] - 41:13, 81:1,	133:17, 226:1,	66:11, 99:2, 99:8,	32:4, 99:2, 99:8	unchecked [1] - 87:9
139:17, 226:4	226:4, 229:2	141:20	turn [34] - 22:25,	unclear [2] - 55:15,
thousand [3] - 12:2,	today [25] - 6:16, 8:21,	trend [1] - 78:1	62:11, 63:17, 67:1,	55:21
101:17, 212:10	15:7, 18:10, 18:18,	Tri [1] - 197:18	71:20, 78:3, 78:4,	unconnected [1] -
thousands [3] - 11:16,	23:18, 27:6, 32:8,	tri [3] - 153:21, 163:6,	78:17, 88:3, 93:20,	103:2
25:12, 55:1	33:17, 38:21, 39:14,	198:15	146:10, 146:18,	under [25] - 13:17,
threat [1] - 73:13	44:15, 50:9, 73:16,	Tri-State [1] - 197:18	148:9, 150:17,	19:17, 20:6, 27:19,
threatened [6] - 45:11,	79:1, 83:17, 87:5,	tri-state [2] - 153:21,	153:16, 154:11,	35:22, 45:9, 73:13,
140:7, 144:8,	145:21, 154:1,	163:6	158:3, 158:24,	74:18, 86:22, 88:23,
153:18, 171:18,	218:7, 228:3,	tri-states [1] - 198:15	159:5, 165:14,	90:16, 98:18, 98:20,
171:20	235:15, 237:5,	trial [17] - 9:10, 11:12,	166:6, 170:2,	98:25, 103:3,
threatening [1] - 67:4	237:10	38:9, 46:19, 49:13,	174:14, 179:9,	128:17, 132:13,
-	together [2] - 38:12,	52:11, 62:3, 70:14,	191:23, 193:17,	159:21, 165:3,
three [27] - 8:9, 9:11,	215:6	77:12, 81:7, 83:19,	193:20, 197:10,	165:9, 165:21,
10:6, 21:13, 44:4, 67:15, 67:17, 67:19,	Tommy [1] - 25:25	91:17, 92:7, 100:7,	197:15, 198:23,	166:1, 171:18,
	tomorrow [1] - 20:13	, , ,	215:13, 216:5,	199:3, 214:9
67:25, 68:3, 68:8,	tonnage [2] - 218:22,	102:24, 107:15, 122:4	225:23, 225:25	underlying [1] - 40:17
74:14, 84:12, 108:5,	219:1		Turner [3] - 38:19,	undermined [1] - 40.17
109:10, 129:3, 142:22, 171:17	took [19] - 40:14,	triangle [1] - 126:21	86:18, 86:19	73:12
143:23, 171:17,		tributaries [3] - 17:15,	turning [1] - 216:9	-
182:14, 183:7, 185:22, 104:2	42:13, 70:12, 84:16,	76:23, 118:15	turns [2] - 53:10,	undermines [1] - 58:7
185:22, 194:3,	85:4, 86:4, 86:16, 86:10, 131:11	tributary [1] - 235:1	93:21	underneath [1] -
194:12, 203:22,	86:19, 131:11,	trick [1] - 176:24		185:25
221:17, 221:20,	173:2, 173:14,	trickle [1] - 186:25	turtles [1] - 235:18	underscores [1] -
221:22	173:17, 178:18,	tried [3] - 56:19,	twice [2] - 93:3, 93:16	75:22
three-quarters [2] -	182:14, 183:19,	142:17, 223:4	two [32] - 3:23, 6:17,	understood [2] -
221:20, 221:22	186:1, 187:22,	trips [1] - 60:24	9:9, 10:14, 28:13,	199:16, 219:10
threeridge [26] -	188:1, 215:25	trouble [1] - 83:15	28:14, 32:10, 42:6,	unequivocal [1] -
67:19, 68:21, 68:25,	tool [1] - 37:14	troubling [2] - 20:25,	44:4, 51:2, 51:9,	54:16
69:3, 69:18, 70:1,	tools [2] - 41:16,	102:8	51:17, 54:25, 57:14,	unfair [1] - 75:15
70:3, 70:12, 71:8,	41:17	true [25] - 15:3, 40:5,	60:3, 68:7, 69:22,	unified [1] - 175:2
71:12, 146:7,	top [12] - 13:12,	51:9, 53:11, 99:15,	75:2, 75:24, 85:9,	unique [4] - 23:24,
146:25, 147:20,	155:25, 158:9,	119:11, 124:9,	95:18, 96:6, 99:7,	24:9, 43:18
148:5, 148:14,	158:20, 170:15,	134:5, 134:11,	100:4, 101:4, 150:5,	unit [1] - 89:8
149:11, 150:4,	196:1, 204:7,	141:21, 153:12,	160:1, 199:6, 230:7,	UNITED [1] - 1:1
155:13, 159:24,	204:25, 215:14,	165:12, 167:16,	236:24	United [7] - 64:11,
167:4, 171:19,	217:12, 235:16,	169:4, 173:15,	type [1] - 138:24	84:4, 150:25,
172:9, 199:7, 203:3,	236:10	182:18, 183:3,	typical [1] - 123:9	154:14, 175:20,
210:1, 212:11	topic [4] - 109:17,	188:9, 197:3, 197:7,	typically [2] - 46:3,	180:6, 216:11
threshhold [1] - 74:23	109:21, 110:18,	199:16, 206:18,	236:8	University [9] - 28:2,
thriving [1] - 62:6	153:16	212:2, 212:23,		28:6, 53:12, 53:17,
throughout [16] -	topics [1] - 175:7	216:22	U	53:25, 54:5, 54:18,
11:2, 11:11, 16:6,	total [6] - 75:6, 76:13,	truth [8] - 73:19,	U.S [30] - 12:11, 20:3,	57:4, 153:7
25:6, 32:14, 46:19,	77:21, 80:11, 99:1,	101:24, 105:5,	0.3 [30] - 12.11, 20.3, 21:6, 35:8, 57:12,	unknown [1] - 29:6
47:21, 61:13, 65:4,	218:23	105:6, 116:15,	63:14, 69:1, 69:9,	unless [2] - 3:5, 81:13
66:15, 73:15, 86:17,	totally [1] - 230:1	116:16	72:4, 93:10, 134:14,	unlimited [1] - 59:14
107:14, 129:6,	touch [1] - 63:18	try [8] - 37:19, 70:7,	146:13, 146:24,	unmistakable [1] -
181:15, 188:22	towards [6] - 25:15,	117:19, 129:14,		13:5
Thursday [3] - 32:23,	108:13, 115:20,	156:14, 198:21,	150:10, 150:12, 152:6, 152:14,	unnecessary [1] -
33:7, 57:5	142:11, 148:9,	219:15, 236:16	, ,	42:25
tidal [2] - 223:12,	172:16	trying [19] - 6:3, 43:19,	155:21, 159:19, 166:10, 166:16	unsatisfied [1] - 90:9
235:10	Town [1] - 5:1	83:20, 95:23, 100:5,	166:10, 166:16,	up [78] - 7:6, 25:5,
tightened [1] - 130:11	track [1] - 177:25	129:18, 143:24,	173:24, 194:25,	31:7, 31:8, 31:11,
tighter [2] - 130:13,	tracking [1] - 135:1	156:22, 157:3,	195:16, 199:1,	40:17, 44:5, 49:10,
130:14	TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1:9	169:1, 194:20,	199:13, 208:15,	57:7, 61:19, 64:7,
tired [1] - 3:5	transcript [3] - 132:17,	194:22, 198:3,	215:16, 220:13,	65:6, 75:9, 78:22,
title [6] - 120:14,	163:15, 238:5	213:13, 223:10,	233:14	84:3, 85:21, 91:23,
120:17, 121:12,	transfer [1] - 39:5	225:11, 227:18,	U.S.A [1] - 1:24	93:6, 100:6, 102:5,
127:14, 170:20,	tree [3] - 65:8, 65: TH		ROUP 202:14	102:13, 106:23,
			€[1] - 222.14	
	N	lason & Lockha	nrt	

91 of 93 sheets

Mason & Lockhart -

	1			
117:23, 119:24,	82:4, 82:19	114:22, 115:2,	63:8, 64:5, 65:1,	108:12, 110:21,
125:17, 126:6,	uses [6] - 30:16, 34:1,	115:5, 115:10,	65:23, 66:16, 68:5,	113:14, 113:25,
126:18, 126:23,	46:3, 91:2, 172:6,	115:16, 115:23,	68:18, 73:19, 74:25,	146:15, 197:18,
129:16, 129:21,	231:23	132:16, 132:18,	75:3, 75:7, 75:8,	205:17
130:11, 131:2,	USGS [8] - 18:23,	132:21, 132:22,	75:13, 75:21, 76:3,	watered [4] - 208:21,
131:5, 131:13,	64:24, 65:12, 66:3,	192:3	76:12, 76:17, 77:4,	209:2, 209:6, 209:11
133:24, 135:4,	77:15, 180:23,	videotape [1] - 107:6	77:13, 79:2, 79:7,	watering [6] - 39:21,
136:22, 138:5,	182:25, 211:2	videotaped [2] -	79:24, 80:1, 80:2,	79:17, 79:19, 80:18,
138:14, 154:7,	102.20, 211.2	106:18, 106:19	80:12, 81:3, 81:16,	80:22, 100:24
159:12, 169:19,	V	view [5] - 148:11,	81:17, 81:21, 81:22,	waters [2] - 8:8, 8:18
169:20, 176:2,	V	151:24, 167:9,	82:2, 82:8, 82:13,	ways [1] - 97:11
176:10, 178:6,	validity [1] - 85:3	232:14, 232:19	82:23, 83:3, 83:11,	weakest [1] - 33:2
179:6, 192:13,	Valuable [1] - 141:24	vigorously [1] - 42:23	83:14, 83:22, 87:3,	weather [3] - 11:18,
192:16, 193:8,	value [1] - 49:7	violation [1] - 155:16	88:6, 88:23, 89:1,	76:15, 78:8
193:25, 194:3,	valued [1] - 124:22	Virginia [1] - 59:8	89:5, 90:1, 90:5,	weathered [1] - 63:15
194:12, 200:13,	van [1] - 5:1	virtually [6] - 21:23,	90:17, 91:3, 92:21,	web [2] - 29:15, 61:14
200:14, 207:8,	varied [1] - 221:16	26:2, 41:24, 59:15,	93:11, 93:23, 94:6,	Wednesday [1] - 57:9
215:14, 216:7,	variety [1] - 235:8	76:2, 95:25	95:20, 97:11, 99:12,	week [3] - 22:10,
216:24, 217:25,	various [5] - 129:1,	visible [1] - 48:20	100:2, 100:16,	25:16, 26:14
218:9, 219:23,	184:3, 220:15,	visit [1] - 48.20	101:3, 102:23,	
220:9, 220:10,	233:24, 234:5	visit [1] - 183.6 voices [1] - 106:22	103:9, 103:13,	weeks [13] - 9:10,
223:6, 223:17,	vast [7] - 21:18, 49:14,		103:16, 108:4,	32:11, 69:12, 69:25,
224:5, 224:13,	75:20, 129:2,	VOLUME [1] - 1:5	121:5, 121:20,	75:24, 95:18, 96:6, 100:5, 146:1
225:7, 228:10,	129:12, 220:24,	volumes [1] - 202:21	122:9, 122:11,	100:5, 146:1,
228:11, 228:13,	221:25	vulnerable [1] - 68:18	124:5, 124:10,	146:16, 151:22,
233:21, 233:24,	vastly [1] - 49:11	14/	124:18, 125:10,	194:10, 195:7
235:19, 235:20,	verifiable [1] - 41:13	W	125:12, 131:12,	Wei [1] - 89:7
235:22, 236:22	verify [3] - 155:19,	wait [1] - 197:21	131:14, 133:25,	weighed [2] - 72:5,
update [1] - 146:14	194:22, 213:14	walk [2] - 117:23,	139:22, 140:15,	93:19
upper [32] - 33:21,	version [1] - 89:19	205:3	141:11, 141:15,	well-being [4] - 47:13,
123:15, 124:9,	versions [1] - 214:10	walking [1] - 107:20	141:20, 156:11,	63:20, 160:18,
124:12, 125:3,	versus [6] - 45:6,	wants [5] - 41:17,	161:2, 162:8,	199:20
126:11, 126:15,	45:15, 57:11, 75:19,	50:22, 58:16, 94:3,	162:16, 165:11,	wells [1] - 17:6
126:22, 127:9,	88:17, 155:21	228:2	167:12, 167:16,	western [1] - 84:4
127:16, 128:23,	vertical [3] - 122:13,	War [2] - 219:23	167:21, 167:23,	wet [5] - 17:3, 50:3,
128:24, 131:16,	122:17, 123:2	Ward [1] - 25:25	167:24, 168:15,	76:1, 95:23, 96:3
135:23, 136:3,	veteran [1] - 25:17	warned [2] - 45:2,	168:18, 172:5,	wetland [1] - 66:10
136:7, 202:23,	viability [1] - 70:22	164:17	173:8, 177:16,	wetted [1] - 139:3
218:22, 218:23.	viable [1] - 37:14		184:3, 184:12,	wetter [1] - 78:13
220:25, 221:9,	vibrant [1] - 87:22	warning [2] - 85:14, 88:17	187:1, 187:3, 187:4,	Wewahitchka [5] -
223:4, 223:21,			187:6, 187:17,	129:9, 176:21,
226:13, 226:18,	Video [1] - 2:5	warrant [1] - 80:22	187:21, 188:2,	176:25, 221:18,
227:22, 233:8,	video [50] - 18:9,	Warren [2] - 179:17,	188:7, 189:3,	225:15
233:21, 233:22,	18:14, 25:21, 58:13,	179:19	190:23, 191:7,	whereas [1] - 46:4
234:2, 234:9	59:21, 87:10, 108:8,	wary [1] - 99:10	195:2, 199:23,	whereby [1] - 29:2
Upper [11] - 10:15,	108:21, 108:25, 109:5, 109:8,	washed [1] - 162:9	206:5, 206:9, 207:4,	WHEREOF [1] -
10:17, 16:13, 16:18,	109.5, 109.8, 109.15,	Washington [1] - 45:6	209:13, 209:17,	238:10
18:2, 40:3, 83:24,	109:11, 109:15, 109:13, 109:19, 109:23,	wasteful [1] - 42:25	209:18, 209:25,	whole [8] - 26:2,
121:13, 133:17,	109:19, 109:23, 110:4, 110:7,	watched [1] - 183:15	213:17, 222:15,	35:15, 40:4, 52:17,
226:1, 226:4		water [171] - 3:7, 9:22,	223:7, 223:8,	62:13, 105:5,
upstream [15] - 9:22,	110:11, 110:16, 110:24, 111:3,	10:16, 12:3, 12:6,	223:14, 223:16,	116:15, 157:3
12:6, 36:20, 37:1,	110:24, 111:3, 111:6, 111:11,	16:21, 18:1, 18:13,	224:6, 224:20,	wide [5] - 61:24,
64:2, 65:24, 96:22,	111:18, 111:22,	19:8, 19:12, 24:11,	225:18, 229:11,	128:8, 144:2,
161:1, 161:16,		24:15, 31:2, 31:5,	229:21, 230:2,	229:12, 235:8
165:11, 172:5,	112:1, 112:5, 112:13, 112:10	33:10, 34:5, 35:11,	230:3, 232:8,	widen [1] - 234:24
230:21, 231:8,	112:13, 112:19, 112:25, 113:5	36:20, 37:1, 39:6,	232:10, 233:18,	widened [1] - 66:5
231:25, 232:5	112:25, 113:5,	40:10, 41:6, 46:16,	234:20, 236:13,	widening [4] - 65:3,
urge [1] - 47:3	113:9, 113:17, 113:21, 114:2,	47:7, 47:17, 49:7,	236:17	65:12, 235:2, 235:7
usage [1] - 102:4	113:21, 114:2, 114:5, 114:9,	49:12, 49:14, 49:20,	Water [14] - 5:10,	wider [1] - 128:15
users [4] - 33:5, 39:6,		49:25, 50:3, 50:11,	15.19 17.22 22.4	widespread [2] -
	114:12, 114:17, THE	E REPORTING G	ROUP , 73:3, 96:12,	15:24, 16:25
	M	lason & Lockha	• • • • •	
	I*			

width [1] - 187:3	17:16, 82:7	Y	
wildlife [1] - 22:6 Wildlife [66] - 20:3,	withdrawn [4] - 18:2, 57:18, 82:9, 82:13	yards [2] - 143:25,	
21:6, 35:9, 54:4,	withdraws [1] - 82:3	144:3	
54:6, 57:7, 63:14,	within-bank [2] -	year [32] - 11:24, 12:2,	
64:17, 64:21, 69:2,	234:7, 235:24	15:22, 16:21, 17:3,	
69:9, 69:23, 70:18,	Witness [1] - 2:2	17:4, 17:5, 20:23,	
72:4, 72:15, 83:7,	WITNESS [9] - 105:7,	21:10, 21:11, 29:4,	
93:11, 93:15,	105:11, 106:11,	36:4, 39:21, 48:14,	
115:14, 117:3,	116:17, 116:21,	48:16, 49:8, 95:24,	
118:24, 119:3,	220:10, 233:10,	96:4, 97:24, 101:17,	
119:8, 134:13,	237:16, 238:10	101:25, 102:2,	
134:14, 145:23,	witness [22] - 32:23,	134:21, 135:6,	
146:6, 146:14,	52:11, 104:9, 106:8,	206:19, 221:16,	
146:24, 147:5,	108:24, 110:20,	222:1, 222:22	
147:12, 147:14,	113:13, 114:21,	years [66] - 8:7, 8:25,	
147:21, 147:23,	116:3, 116:7, 117:1,	9:5, 9:25, 10:2,	
148:10, 148:18,	140:17, 140:18,	13:23, 13:25, 14:15,	
149:9, 149:21,	145:4, 145:15,	17:1, 20:16, 20:20, 21:12, 21:15, 26:4	
150:10, 150:13,	156:21, 156:22,	21:13, 21:15, 26:4, 36:25, 39:5, 41:22,	
151:1, 151:21,	157:2, 157:11,	42:11, 42:12, 45:6,	
151:22, 152:4, 152:6, 152:14	192:20, 218:2	45:15, 50:3, 53:7,	
152:6, 152:14, 159:18, 159:20,	witnesses [3] - 22:1,	45.15, 50.3, 55.7, 54:25, 56:8, 59:12,	
160:6, 173:8,	40:15, 192:11	60:3, 63:16, 70:25,	
173:24, 173:25,	Woodruff [15] - 63:25,	74:14, 76:1, 76:3,	
179:22, 180:10,	66:21, 72:9, 120:20, 120:23, 122:10,	76:4, 76:8, 77:20,	
182:3, 194:25,	120.23, 122.10, 122:18, 123:7,	84:14, 85:24, 90:4,	
195:17, 195:22,	123:12, 134:5,	91:19, 93:4, 93:16,	
195:23, 196:13,	161:14, 161:25,	95:10, 95:20, 95:23,	
197:2, 199:2, 214:5,	162:22, 164:5,	96:2, 96:7, 96:9,	
215:16, 233:15	226:19	96:15, 99:4, 101:4,	
Wildlife's [2] - 71:3,	word [2] - 154:9,	101:9, 103:11,	
199:12	213:18	117:5, 150:5,	
William [1] - 59:7	words [6] - 13:16,	152:18, 163:1,	
willy [1] - 130:3	16:1, 19:7, 21:14,	164:6, 174:9,	
willy-nilly [1] - 130:3	38:23, 176:25	187:13, 187:24, 187:25, 191:7,	
windows [1] - 172:7	works [6] - 89:8,	222:23, 225:2, 231:7	
WINE [17] - 1:17, 3:15,	91:12, 156:13,	yellow [4] - 13:6,	
116:24, 117:10,	169:22, 180:14,	20:20, 21:20, 123:3	
140:16, 156:20,	180:16	yield [2] - 25:13, 87:13	
156:25, 157:14, 160:22, 217:21	world [3] - 67:22,	yourself [4] - 158:8,	
169:22, 217:21, 218:2, 218:5,	91:20, 97:16	175:16, 207:6, 215:9	
231:16, 231:18,	worse [6] - 15:6,	, -,	
237:4, 237:8, 237:13	22:21, 32:7, 52:10, 68:22	Z	
wine [1] - 118:8	worst [4] - 13:13,		
Wine [1] - 3:14	34:4, 39:24, 99:23	Zell [1] - 8:1	
Winn [1] - 6:8	worth [2] - 144:12,	Zeng [1] - 89:7	
WINN [1] - 1:22	152:18	zero [6] - 9:7, 14:14, 14:17, 67:6, 73:20,	
winter [1] - 60:11	write [1] - 85:14	90:6	
winters [1] - 78:13	written [8] - 11:25,	Ziewitz [8] - 180:10,	
wipe [3] - 99:12,	28:13, 33:3, 65:16,	181:10, 181:11,	
100:1, 101:2	73:15, 114:20,	181:12, 181:21,	
wipes [1] - 101:9	148:3, 178:23	182:1, 186:7, 211:13	
wiping [2] - 98:19,	wrote [3] - 35:9,	zones [1] - 86:11	
98:24	38:12, 60:21	zoology [1] - 54:2	
withdrawal [3] -		zoom [1] - 136:25	
81:22, 81:24, 82:21	_		
withdrawals [2] -	THE	E REPORTING GROU	Ρ
	M	lason & Lockhart	
3 of 93 sheets			