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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Lake Seminole. In that part of the Flint, the Lower Flint Basin, and throughout the Lower Flint Basin there is an intense amount of agricultural irrigation. Center pivots are shown there by the circles. Not all farmers irrigate; 50 percent do not. But the amount of irrigation there is profound. And that has happened since the 1970's.

This is the chart, your Honor, of the growth in irrigation since the 1970's.

And here, as will be the case throughout our presentation at trial, we have internal documents from the State of Georgia among state employees that describe exactly what's happened over time. And what they say, without any ambiguity, is that when thousands of irrigation systems are all operating during dry weather, you can see a significant reduction in Flint River flows. This will occur in documents we see in this case over and over again from the 1990's to the present day.

And to put this in further perspective, in a drought year -- and this is a document from 2002 written by the former director of THE REPORTING GROUP
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


|  | TRIAL - Octobe | 31, | ol. I) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 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 in this case as well. It's from 2011. | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | Apalachicola River ecosystems. And these are from 1999. |
| 25 | And there Georgia, using its own data, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | And, your Honor, if I might step over to THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 18 |  | 20 |
| 1 | determined that too much water was being | 1 | the chart here that shows the Apalachicola |
| 2 | withdrawn from the Upper Floridan Aquifer in | 2 | River Basin, these particular guidelines from |
| 3 | the Dougherty Plain, which is in the Flint | 3 | EPA and from U.S. Fish and Wildlife in 1999 |
| 4 | Basin. It's a relatively large area in the | 4 | are for the ecological health of that entire |
| 5 | Flint Basin. | 5 | river basin. That's a different question |
| 6 | And, sir, this gentleman depicted on the | 6 | under federal law from whether endangered |
| 7 | screen is named Napoleon Caldwell. We'll be | 7 | species will persist with low flows in |
| 8 | playing his -- with your permission, your | 8 | particular discrete areas. This is a |
| 9 | Honor, his deposition designations by video | 9 | measurement of what's necessary to maintain |
| 10 | later today. He has worked with Georgia's | 10 | the health of the entire river ecosystem. |
| 11 | Environmental Protection Division for decades | 11 | So, your Honor, if we take a look at the |
| 12 | with responsibility for agricultural | 12 | first column -- and we'll spend some time on |
| 13 | permitting and water resources. | 13 | this, including with Mr. Struhs tomorrow. |
| 14 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 14 | But if you take a look at the first column |
| 15 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's Florida | 15 | there, there are a number of one-day minimum |
| 16 | Exhibit 24 at page 3-9. | 16 | flows that must be exceeded in all years. |
| 17 | But that's not the only study in that | 17 | That means you should not, for the health of |
| 18 | particular exhibit. Today, later today, | 18 | the river ecosystem, dip below those flows. |
| 19 | we'll be focused on this particular study as | 19 | Well, your Honor, on the next slide in |
| 20 | well by Georgia, which is in the same exhibit | 20 | yellow, over the last 15 years the |
| 21 | at page 3-6. And, your Honor, this is | 21 | Apalachicola dipped below those levels |
| 22 | particularly revealing and important. Here | 22 | consistently. These are one-day minimums. |
| 23 | at Bainbridge, this is a USGS gage at | 23 | Year after year after year including in 2007, |
| 24 | Bainbridge. I'll point out, your Honor, on | 24 | 2008, 2011, 2012. And, your Honor, what's |
| 25 | the bigger map where Bainbridge is. | 25 | particularly troubling, if I might invite the |
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Court's attention to 2016, we're below those levels now. We were below those levels in July and August and September. Those are one-day minimum flows.

But there are other charts in this same EPA and U.S. Fish and Wildlife guidance from 1999 that recognize it's not just the one-day minimum flow that matters. For the ecosystem it's also very important that you don't have repeated low flows year after year after year. And so this particular column that I have highlighted is the one-day minimum exceeded in three or four years. In other words, you should not go below that number more than one in four years.

Those are much higher numbers than we have on our river. In fact, this chart, your Honor, shows vast noncompliance with that guideline. There are -- and that's what the yellow blocks are here on the chart.

There are a few months in 2005 and 2003 and 2014 and ' 13 that are in compliance, but virtually everything else is out of compliance with those federal guidelines.

So, your Honor, there will be multiple THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
on Apalachicola Bay and Apalachicola River and the ecosystems that surround them. But I'll start by saying that Florida has made a commitment since the 1960's to protect natural areas. In fact, Secretary Steverson's testimony is about that. And this commitment was made particularly in the Apalachicola far before these impacts have been felt, far before irrigation exploded, far before Atlanta boomed in size.

So this particular slide is Article II, Section 7 of Florida's Constitution where it shall be the policy of the state to conserve and protect natural resources and scenic beauty. This is a public policy that Florida pursues. Secretary Steverson's prefiled direct talks about it. And he'll be available to talk about it in detail today. In particular, about all of the acreage that's been set aside, purchased, to avoid development and to preserve these ecosystems.

So there's a very specific problem occurring in Apalachicola Bay. It's that the ecosystem, which is a unique estuary, is changing. And it's changing because the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

authors, concludes it's likely that a sequence of events occurred whereby low river flow led to increased salinity in
Apalachicola Bay for a multi-year period which led to increases in oyster parasites, predators, unknown pathogens causing elevated mortality, particularly among juvenile oysters.

Now, that's pretty close to what you just heard Mr. Berrigan say on his tape.

Now, that's not all the evidence we'll have about the bay. We have an expert named Dr. Glibert, who is an expert on estuaries. And she'll talk about the profound changes in the food web, which extend -- which certainly include impacts on foundational species like oysters, but include other species and other impacts in the phytoplankton and other elements of the estuary. But her conclusion is if something isn't done, this will be a permanent change to the bay. And it's already been impacted very severely.

So, of course, we also have a case about the Apalachicola River. And when I say the river, I really also mean the floodplain and THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP
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some of the sloughs I mentioned. They feed off of the main channel, and they carry water to the floodplain. They're essential for this ecosystem to be healthy. And when the water recedes, when there is not enough flow from Georgia to the Apalachicola River, they dry up. Here is a map of some of the sloughs. The sloughs are up and down the entire -- or most of the river; and you can find them in many places. But here is what happens when they dry up. You're stranding breeding fish. You're killing mussels. All sorts of other parts of the ecosystem suffer. These are dead mussels in a slough right here. And you fundamentally change what's happening out in the ecosystem.

This is what it's supposed to look like, your Honor, in the floodplain. There's some beautiful cypress and tupelo trees. But when the floodplain doesn't fill, you have profound impacts on the forest, too.

So this data, this chart, is from Dr. Allan's testimony. And it -- it's between 1976 and 2004. It doesn't even include the most significant recent droughts, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
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| 1 | a sufficiently serious regulatory program | 1 | occurs. And indeed, there can be a solution |
| 2 | overseeing irrigation in the Lower Flint | 2 | that, without harming farmers, limits that |
| 3 | Basin. | 3 | irrigation. |
| 4 | Through Dr. Sunding and others we'll | 4 | 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 | 19 | And we're trying to save them. |
| 20 | individual farmers. | 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 | farmers to apply for and get permits with | 23 | Mr. Primis? |
| 24 | virtually no environmental scrutiny. And it | 24 | MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, Craig Primis |
| 25 | created a problem that it needs to fix now. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | for the State of Georgia. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> 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 | and 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 | (Recess Called) |
| 10 | And what Georgia has done has occurred in the | 10 | (Time Noted: 10:15 a.m.) |
| 11 | last 30 years to change that. But even if | 11 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? |
| 12 | you only focus on the last 15 years or so, | 12 | MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, Special Master |
| 3 | Georgia took what it acknowledged was a good | 13 | Lancaster. |
| 14 | faith step to pass the Flint River Drought | 14 | And may it please the Court, it is a |
| 15 | Protection Act in 2000 to reduce irrigation | 15 | privilege to stand before you today on behalf |
| 16 | and then, because it became too expensive, | 16 | of the people of Georgia. We very much |
| 17 | they halted it. | 17 | appreciate the time and attention the Special |
| 18 | Your Honor, if there's anything that's | 18 | Master has dedicated to this case; and now, |
| 19 | the status quo it's protecting what Florida | 19 | we look forward to presenting our evidence. |
| 20 | has set aside and protected in the | 20 | As we do so, it will quickly become clear |
| 21 | Apalachicola River and the Basin; and I don't | 21 | that Florida cannot meet the significant |
| 22 | think it's appropriate, and we'll argue | 22 | burden it faces in this case, and the remedy |
| 23 | vigorously that it's not appropriate to | 23 | it seeks could have serious consequences for |
| 24 | preserve, simply for economic reasons, | 24 | Georgia and its citizens with little or no |
| 25 | unnecessary and wasteful irrigation where it | 25 | benefit to Florida or the Apalachicola River |
|  | Mason \& Lockhart |  | Mason \& Lockhart |

or Bay.
The Supreme Court has repeatedly warned that an equitable apportionment is an extraordinary remedy and not one to be imposed lightly. Justice Cardozo put it best 80 years ago in Washington versus Oregon. As I have shown on the screen, there the Court said, before this Court can be moved to exercise its extraordinary power under the Constitution to control the conduct of one state at the suit of another, the threatened invasion of rights must be of serious magnitude and it must be established by clear and convincing evidence.

50 years later in Colorado versus New Mexico, the Court repeated the need for clear and convincing evidence, and it explained that the consequences of getting this wrong can be devastating.

If I can refer the Court to the monitor, the Court in Colorado explained that society's interest in minimizing erroneous decisions in equitable apportionment cases requires that hard facts, not suppositions or opinions, be the basis for interstate

## THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

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. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Florida barely mentions these critical issues, but Georgia will address all of them; and we will urge the Court to do so, too.

And just so there is no misunderstanding on one key point, Georgia emphatically rejects the suggestion that it has not been a good steward of water. We are proud to defend and will defend Georgia's stewardship of this resource in both metropolitan Atlanta and the agricultural sector of the state.

At the outset, I want to emphasize what is at stake in this case. What is at stake is the economic well-being of millions of Georgians who depend on the Chattahoochee River, the Flint River, and the federal reservoir system, which Mr. Perry failed to mention, for their drinking water, their food, their jobs, their entire way of life. What's at stake is an economy that supports millions of jobs and billions of dollars in economic activity throughout Georgia and beyond.

Let's look at some of the key differences between Georgia and Florida in the ACF Basin. I put on the screen and the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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be Boston, right down the road.
With these basic facts in mind, I would 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, 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 its population and its economy. That is why 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
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 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

and ends at that very first step.
Florida devoted just two pages of its pretrial brief to its alleged injury, offering predictions of doom, but no actual 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 that is true for two reasons. In many cases, Florida has no injury at all or its claimed injury is pure speculation. And in others, the harm Florida claims was not caused by Georgia; and there is no clear, convincing evidence to claim that it was.

One injury allegation we can dispense with quickly is economic injury. Florida hired not one, but two Ph.D. economists as experts in this case. And neither of them offer the opinion that Georgia's consumption of water harmed Florida's economy. Florida's lead economist, Dr. Sunding, never even looked at impacts on the Florida side of the border.

If you look at the screen, you will see where he admitted that. He was asked, have THE REPORTING GROUP
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you attempted to quantify in any economic or 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 Mason \& Lockhart
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
and thousands of hours of research and analysis, Dr. Pine published his findings in a peer-reviewed scientific journal. As the Court can see in the key excerpts I'm putting on the screen now, Dr. Pine and his co-authors reported, we did not find correlations between Apalachicola River discharge measures, which are flows, and our estimated relative natural mortality rate or oyster recruitment rates.

They went on to state, the overall relationships between freshwater flows, drought frequency and severity, oyster recruitment, and harvest dynamics remain unclear.

In a case where Florida needs clear and convincing evidence of harm, a contemporaneous finding by a leading Florida oyster biologist that the relationship between freshwater flow and oyster mortality is, quote, unclear should just about end the inquiry.

Now, recall that Florida had alleged in paragraph 54 of the complaint that it was low flows from Georgia that caused the collapse. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

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. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

| 65 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 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 decline | 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 th | 7 that claim. Most notably, Florida's expert |
| 8 decline in some of the tree species. Th | 8 Dr. David Allan, he did not even attempt to |
| 9 same author of this report is Helen Light | 9 determine and offers no op |
| 10 created the data that goes to these tre | 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 | 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 popu | 15 are three endangered mussels in the |
| 16 But let's look at a paper written by on | 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, | 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 | 22 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 THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 whether these three species of mussels are THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
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| 1 Mr. Perry mentioned occur less frequently and | 1 increasing or decreasing or stable? |
| 2 for shorter periods of time. | 2 His answer. I did not do any population |
| 3 So let's flip back now to that USGS | 3 studies on these three species. |
| 4 Florida survey which explains what happens | 4 That is a stunning admission in a case |
| 5 when the channel is widened and the riverbed | 5 where Florida seeks to cap Georgia's water |
| 6 is lowered. As a | 6 consumption on the theory that the mussels |
| 7 consequence of this decreased inundation, the | 7 are in peril. In fact, for two of these |
| 8 quantity and quality of floodplain habitats | 8 three endangered species pictured on the |
| 9 for fish, mussels, and other aquatic | 9 screen, Dr. Allan conceded he has no evidence |
| 10 organisms have declined. And wetland | 10 that Georgia caused them any harm. He |
| 11 forests, those trees Mr. Perry mentioned, of | 11 admitted in his deposition and will admit |
| 12 the floodplain are changing in response to | 12 here in court that he has no evidence Georgia |
| 13 drier conditions. And this is a key | 13 did anything to harm either the purple |
| 14 statement, and we will return to it | 14 bankclimber or the Chipola slabshell. He |
| 15 throughout this case | 15 testified, quote, his analysis did not pursue |
| 16 Water level decline caused by channel | 16 the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber, |
| 7 change is probably the most serious | 17 and he admitted that the Chipola slabshell |
| 18 anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far | 18 was, quote, not vulnerable to water level |
| 19 in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. | 19 changes. |
| 20 All of these impacts were caused by Jim | 20 That just leaves one endangered muscle, |
| 21 Woodruff Dam or by dredging activities along | 21 the fat threeridge. And on that one, Florida |
| 22 the river, not by Georgia, just as Florida, | 22 has proof problems that may be even worse |
| 23 its regulatory agencies, and now its own | 23 than its oyster problem. When Dr. Allan |
| 24 expert had said time and again before Florida | 24 decided to base his entire mussel study on |
| 25 decided to sue Georgi | 25 the fat threeridge mussel, he didn't realize |
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that research sponsored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had found millions more fat threeridge mussels than were previously thought to exist in the Apalachicola River. Yet, Florida advances Dr. Allan to say that the Supreme Court should find that they are on the brink of a catastrophe.

As your Honor can see on the screen, in a report released by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service less than one month ago -- I just want to point out this was released several weeks ago in October -- the Service reported that there's 10 times the suitable habitat than previously thought to exist; and it offered the following conclusions: Based on these densities and the area of habitat mapped in each river reach, current estimates of the population size of fat threeridge in the action area range from about 6 million to $18,650,000$ individuals with a mean of approximately 12 million.

In fact, after two major droughts in 2006 and 2008 -- 2011, the Fish and Wildlife Service reported in that report just a few weeks ago that considering the recent THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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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.

Florida has been predicting irreparable harm to these mussels for years, and their THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
dire predictions have not come to pass.
And Dr. Allan is in no position to contradict Fish and Wildlife's finding that there are millions of these in Florida, and that the population is stable and doing well. As the Court can see on the screen, Dr. Allan was asked, do you have any idea how many fat threeridge mussels currently reside in the Apalachicola River Basin?

His testimony, I do not.
So Dr. Allan claims Georgia is killing the fat threeridge, but he doesn't even know how many there are or whether the population is growing or shrinking. And he has no explanation for why the federal government is finding millions of these creatures when his analysis predicts their demise. This is not the clear and convincing evidence of harm that Justice Cardozo had in mind.

Let's turn now to the Gulf surgeon, which Florida has also claimed is being harmed. Dr. Allan, once again, has no idea how many there are or how they are doing. As I show on the screen, he was asked, do you have any information about the change in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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 channel 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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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 put it on the screen. You haven't studied THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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any bird species?
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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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 new testimony, to impose a cap on Georgia in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart 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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
would not feel the impact of that at the state line during a drought. The Flint is just one piece of an integrated, managed water system operated by the Army Corps of Engineers. Florida has a built-in insurance policy in the Corps, and a cap on Georgia would do nothing to increase that minimum flow in drought while imposing significant pain on Georgia. That is why Georgia overwhelmingly bears the risk in this case.

And to look at this from a slightly different perspective, we will show at trial that Florida loses far more water on its side of the border than Georgia could possibly consume within its borders. USGS gage data shows that Florida's contribution to streamflows in the Apalachicola has diminished by $4,000 \mathrm{cfs}$, meaning that Florida's contributions to Apalachicola streamflow over the last 40 years have shrunk from 20 percent of total flow to just 8 percent. Florida has no explanation for its reduced contributions to streamflow and has produced no evidence in discovery that it has done anything to research it or reverse this THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
statement today, Florida barely mentions water use in the Atlanta metro region. That's a major retreat from Florida's complaint, and it didn't happen by accident.

Discovery has shown that the Atlanta metro region is an outstanding steward of water recognized by the Environmental Protection Agency and other organizations for its conservation and efficiency. The metro district has imposed some of the most aggressive conservation measures in the country, including conservation pricing, leak abatement, incentives to install high efficiency fixtures for municipal and industrial use. In fact, the Georgia Stewardship Act of 2010 imposed a residential ban on outdoor watering between the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m.; and Georgia imposed a complete ban on outdoor watering in Metro Atlanta during the 2007-2008 drought.

Those are just examples. The list goes on and on.

These measures have had a significant positive impact on overall water consumption in Atlanta. Atlanta has seen decreases in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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.

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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| Maybe that's why Florida for the third <br> time dropped the expert they hired to criticize Georgia's M \& I water use and conservation efforts. His name was John Dracup. And like Dr. Jenkins on the fish and Dr. Phaneuf on the economy, Florida is not bringing Dracup to trial either. <br> Now, I want to pause for a moment to highlight one of the more surprising statements in Florida's pretrial brief. Florida claims on page 17 of its brief that Georgia's M \& I consumption in Atlanta will continue to grow significantly unless steps are taken to limit future consumptions. And Florida takes figures out of Georgia's pending water supply request with the Army Corps to suggest Georgia's water consumption in the Atlanta area will increase by 70 percent by 2050. <br> Florida knows that there is a fundamental difference between water consumption and water withdrawal. The figures Florida cites in its brief are withdrawal numbers. And we don't want the Court to be confused. They don't take into THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | growing exponentially, as Florida alleges. <br> It is also important to remember that <br> before Atlanta can use any water from the <br> federal reservoirs, it must seek approval from the Army Corps. Georgia has made those requests. And after careful study and consultation with Fish and Wildlife, the Army Corps has repeatedly concluded that its federal reservoirs have sufficient capacity to provide the Atlanta region with its requested water supply and any other project purposes, including the protection of endangered species in Florida. <br> With its claims about water use in metro Atlanta in deep trouble, Florida spends the majority of its pretrial brief and, again, its opening statement today focusing on irrigation in southwest Georgia. Florida will, we suspect, spend most of this trial trying to establish that Georgia's irrigation is excessive and should be capped. Florida is wrong on that, too. Most water used for irrigation comes from groundwater pumped from the Upper Floridan Aquifer. It is a highly rechargeable aquifer, which means that when THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
| account the fact that metro Atlanta returns between 75 and 80 percent of the water it withdraws back into the system for downstream users. <br> 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. <br> 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. <br> 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. <br> Consumptive use in Atlanta for M \& I is not THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | 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. <br> 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. <br> 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 |
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
testify that the Corps has discretion and that it always uses that discretion to pass through additional water coming in from the Flint. The data just doesn't bear that out. Dr. Shanahan's own charts show that there is no correlation between increases in flows on the Flint during drought and flows released by the Army Corps at the state line.
Instead, the Corps maintains state line flows at roughly 5,000 cfs while in drought operations even with a spike in the Flint. That's just how the system works, and those are the hard facts.

Florida cannot change the expert testimony, which brings us to the fourth Florida expert that didn't make the cut for trial. In addition to Dr. Shanahan, Florida hired James Barton to address Army Corps operations. Mr. Barton has 30 years of real world experience in reservoir management and operations and, in fact, he managed reservoirs for the Army Corps of Engineers. He just about summed up Florida's problem when he was asked, if you need a predictable flow at a predictable time, you have to have THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
sets the minimum flows; and Florida knows that the Corps has considered the appropriate minimum state line flow for Florida twice in the last five years. And both times it found 5,000 cfs to be sufficient.

Mr. Perry flashed up the 1999 EPA guidelines with specified flows that he said were significant. He didn't mention that those were never adopted. He also didn't mention that in the Army Corps and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife review of the recent water supply request, both times the Corps conducted an extensive process with technical input from the States; and both times the Corps consulted with Fish and Wildlife, which has now twice in the last five years issued biological opinions signing off on the Corps's minimum flows. Florida has already weighed in and pushed for greater flows from the Corps at every turn because it knows that however this case turns out, it still needs the Army Corps if it is ever to consistently receive the additional water it seeks across the state line.

The final point I would like to address THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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The other reason the Court should be skeptical is that Florida keeps changing what it is asking for. At the beginning of the case, Florida said it wanted to cap Georgia at 1992 levels. Now, that request is nowhere to be found. Then Dr. Sunding served his first expert report in February of 2016. At this point he had been working on the case for four years. And what did he do? He suggested four alternatives to generate 1,000 cfs. Suddenly that number doubled to 2,000 cfs in Dr. Sunding's next report issued just a couple of months later. When asked why he did that, Dr. Sunding had no explanation other than discussions with lawyers.

It's also important to note that Dr. Sunding never once, not until two weeks ago, as I mentioned before, suggested a cap on water use in nondrought years. In fact, I will show on the screen that Dr. Sunding was asked whether there is biological harm in the normal and wet years? I was trying to find out why he only had drought year remedies.

He said, virtually all the discussions THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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that I have had with other Florida experts have focused on dry years. I just haven't heard any issues raised about average or wet year problems.

That's why Dr. Sunding never previously proposed before two weeks ago a cap for nondrought years. And it's consistent with what Florida has been telling the federal 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 sworn statement in federal court, which I will put on the screen, Mr. Barr said, in years of at least average annual flows, the Apalachicola River's flows are more than adequate to connect floodplain channels and inundate aquatic habitat that is needed to sustain the significant biological processes on which the health of the river and the Apalachicola Bay relies. And then he goes on to say, upstream consumption is not significant enough to interfere with those processes.

And that was submitted in federal court THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
in 2009.
One final point on Dr. Sunding's evolving numbers. Not a single other expert on the Florida side used those numbers to see if those cuts would improve the environment or the ecology. Dr. Allan never tested the river species against those numbers, and the bay ecology experts didn't use those numbers in their remedy scenarios. No one used those numbers. It was just Dr. Sunding developing different ways to cut Georgia's water use with no connection to hydrologic or biological change in the basin. Not a single biologist or ecologist on the Florida side evaluates the impacts of those cuts in the real world.

At the same time that Dr. Sunding is bouncing around with his numbers, there is another Florida expert, Mr. Flewelling -Dr. Flewelling. He's running something that he calls a remedy scenario. I want to pause on this. His remedy scenario calls for a 50 percent cut in agricultural irrigation every year, not to mention other restrictions he would place on Georgia.

## THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Dr. Allan's analysis will bring a total of 29 fewer low flow days to the tupelo trees. That's not very much. But when he admits on the stand that it's 29 days over 16 years, the Court might ask whether it makes any sense at all to crush Georgia's farmers for an average of less than two more days at optimal flows for the tupelo trees.

The other reason the Court should be very wary of Dr. Sunding's proposed cuts is that they are so extreme, they would effectively wipe out all water use in Georgia, both in metro Atlanta and the agricultural sector in the southwest part of the state. And that's true even if we use the inflated estimates of consumptive use developed by Florida's experts.

For example, on the agricultural side, Dr. Sunding now says that Georgia can cut irrigation by 1687 cfs. But Florida's own groundwater expert, Dr. Langseth, he testified at his deposition that Georgia's maximum irrigation in the worst drought on record was only 1200 cfs . As the Court can see on the screen, if the Court accepts THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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| 1 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip | 1 | clips 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 Honor, on the same |
| 5 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 5 | exhibit, Florida Exhibit 4, page 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 Honor, the next clip |
| 8 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 8 | is, likewise, about Florida Exhibit 4. And |
| 9 | MR. PERRY: And here in particular, on | 9 | the page number that's the subject matter of |
| 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, the next set of |
| 13 | again, in Florida Exhibit 24, is page 3-6, | 13 | clips deal with Florida Exhibit 18 which, as |
| 14 | and in particular, table 3-1. | 14 | you can see on this page, is an e-mail from |
| 15 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 15 | Mr. Napoleon Caldwell to the then director, |
| 16 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the following is | 16 | Mr. Harold Reheis, of the Environmental |
| 17 | additional testimony on that same topic and | 17 | Protection Division of Georgia. |
| 18 | that same table on page 3-6 of Exhibit 24. | 18 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 19 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 19 | MR. PERRY: The next clip is about |
| 20 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, this particular | 20 | Florida Exhibit 18. And in particular, the |
| 21 | clip is about the same topic, but also | 21 | text of that e-mail at GA 98806. |
| 22 | employs FX -- Florida Exhibit 259. | 22 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 23 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 23 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor -- again, your |
| $24$ | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of | $24$ | Honor, this clip relates to that same e-mail |
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| 1 | consumptive use budgets in Georgia and | 1 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 2 | sustainability. It involves Florida | 2 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, again on Florida |
| 3 | Exhibit 65 and then also Florida Exhibit 109. | 3 | Exhibit 18, on the second page of that |
| 4 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 4 | exhibit, that page is numbered GA 98807. |
| 5 | MR. PERRY: Again, testimony regarding | 5 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 6 | Florida Exhibit 65. | 6 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next group |
| 7 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 7 | of clips relate to a file produced from |
| 8 | MR. PERRY: And here, your Honor, the | 8 | Napoleon Caldwell's historic files by |
| 9 | testimony focuses on Florida Exhibit 65, page | 9 | Georgia. It's Florida Exhibit 16. And you |
| 10 | GA 16745. | 10 | will see a file folder, and then the clips |
| 11 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 11 | will examine and discuss the contents of that |
| 12 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip | 12 | folder. |
| 13 | is, again, about Florida Exhibit 65, and in | 13 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 14 | particular a slide in that exhibit which is | 14 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, this particular |
| 15 | numbered GA 126762. | 15 | testimony is about a document in that file. |
| 16 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 16 | It relates to an issue near the Atlantic |
| 17 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, on the same | 17 | coast of Georgia where a consumption cap was |
| 18 | topic, this clip relates to FX 109, which is | 18 | applied. |
| 19 | an article where Mr. Napoleon Caldwell, the | 19 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 20 | witness here, is a co-author entitled | 20 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip, |
| 21 | Ensuring Sustainable Water Supplies Into the | 21 | likewise, relates to Florida Exhibit 16. |
| 22 | Future, Perspectives on Managing Consumptive | 22 | It's a different document in the same file |
| 23 | Use. | 23 | from Mr. Napoleon Caldwell. And the page |
| 24 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 24 | number is GA 477297. |
| 25 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of | 25 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
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Q. It's where the Apalachicola River begins?
A. Currently, yes.
Q. Okay. And in the ACF Basin, water coming from Georgia goes through this dam that's here on the screen before it becomes the Apalachicola River. Correct?
A. Currently that is correct.
Q. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, I want to direct you to another slide in this presentation. Let's go to page 3.

And we can put it on the screen. The title for this slide is Damage in the Upper River. Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you're talking about the Apalachicola River in this -- in this page. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And the chart on the right shows a change in water levels at the Chattahoochee Gage from 1938 to 1998. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And when it says Chattahoochee, that's referring to the gage which actually sits on the Florida side of the border. Right?
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## A. That is correct.

Q. And just --
A. Just downstream of the lock and dam.
Q. 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?
A. Yes. It -- it measures the water that comes through the dam and -- yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Hoehn, there is a vertical dotted line on the chart that appears in your document here. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that vertical line was put there to show approximately the time when the Jim Woodruff Dam was built. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And --
A. And a copy -- just for your information, the preceding picture is one showing when it was actually being constructed.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Hoehn.
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A. It's a historical photo.
Q. Now, with the chart and the vertical line, the yellow bars just to the right of it, they go down. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that is showing a decline in the level of the riverbed after the building of Jim Woodruff Dam. Correct?
A. That's correct. And this is typical of any dam that is constructed; you will have this change in the riverbed.
Q. And Jim Woodruff Dam is no exception. Right?
A. It's no exception.
Q. Now, the first bullet point on damage in the upper river says, the down-cutting of the channel 5 feet. Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And what that means is that the riverbed has been lowered 5 feet. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And it also means --
A. At the time that this was developed, that's what it was.
Q. And this was developed at approximately 2006. Correct?
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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.
Q. 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?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, this 5 foot down-cutting the channel, that damaged the upper river. True?
A. It caused -- as you said, it requires more water to reflood those portions of the river.
Q. And your slide calls it damage in the upper river. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. You're not saying it's not damaged?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm just saying it requires more water.
Q. Now, another effect is that there is a lot of hydrologic connectivity. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And it also reduces populations of valued species when you have a down-cutting of the river channel like that. Correct?
A. Correct. And the species that are referred to THE REPORTING GROUP
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here are those that require some of the spring runs that are immediately downstream of where the dam is and are also referred to in the upper reach as part of the map that is in my direct testimony.
Q. One of the species that has a reduced population because of the down-cutting of the channel just south of the dam is the Gulf sturgeon. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in addition to needing more water to fill the channel to the same height, your presentation makes the point that more water is needed to reverse existing damage and prevent additional harm. Would you agree with that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, there's a map on page 5 of your direct testimony. And I would like to put that up on the screen right now. Do you have your direct testimony?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, do you have a copy of that?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes.
MR. PRIMIS: You know what; we're going to put it on the screen, so we'll see it.
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Matt, this is from his direct testimony,
table -- map 5.
There it is.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this map that we have depicted on the screen, it breaks the river up into different segments. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And those impacts -- those damaging impacts you were just describing on your PowerPoint, those are in the part marked upper reach on your map. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So if --
A. But it is not the entire upper reach.
Q. If we expand that part -- I just want to let the Court know what section we're talking about -the Chattahoochee Gage is the one that sits up at Lake Seminole just south of there. Correct?
A. That's correct. It's labeled as a -- looks like kind of an orange triangle.
Q. And the upper reach goes from about river mile 80 on the bottom all the way up to the Lake Seminole. Correct?
A. Correct. And river mile 80, for the way we THE REPORTING GROUP
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consider it, is approximately Blountstown, the city of Blountstown.
Q. Okay. Mr. Hoehn, let's look at the next slide of your slide deck. Let's go back to that one.

MR. PRIMIS: And, Matt, this would be Georgia Exhibit -- you have it, good -- 72.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Okay. So now, we're looking at the next page of your presentation. We're still in the upper river. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And this one is entitled Destruction of Channel and Riparian Areas. Right?
A. The title of this one is Channel and Riparian Areas. But what I'm going to say is this is not related to just the upper river. The upper river had very minimal changes and dredging and sand deposition.
Q. Okay. You have called this slide Destruction of Channel and Riparian Areas. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when you say riparian areas, you mean the floodplain. Right?
A. No. Actually, I'm meaning the areas adjacent to the river. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. Okay. And the first bullet says one form of the destruction of the channel is channelization. Do you see that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you explain what channelization means.
A. Back in the 1940's when the Congress authorized the modern navigation channel, they basically set out that there would be a 100 foot wide by 9 foot deep channel. And then in the 1960's -- '50's and ' 60 's, those plans were actually developed.
And so the channelization is those designs by which the Corps then developed the modern navigation channel.
Q. And channelization has the effect of making the river wider and deeper. Correct?
A. It can.
Q. And then the next bullet under Destruction of Channel and Riparian Areas says, dredging and sand disposal. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, a minute ago you said that dredging and sand disposal was more of an issue in the middle river than the upper river?
A. Middle and upper.
Q. Okay.
A. It has occurred, you know, in various locations; but the vast majority of any of the dredging occurred in roughly three areas. And they received, you know, the -- probably 80 percent of all the dredging and all the dredging activities, you know, throughout the entire time. And those were approximately right at Blountstown, right at approximately mile -- just south of the Wewahitchka Gage, which is about mile 40, and then a little bit further south than that in what we call the Orley Slough reach. Those received the vast majority of where disposal activities occur, and it's very limited.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, just try and stay focused on the questions I'm asking you. Your counsel will have an opportunity to ask you follow-up questions. So --
A. I'm trying to give you a full answer, sir.
Q. I understand, sir.

So dredging and sand disposal. Dredging is when the Army Corps actually goes in and digs up part of the river. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And sand disposal is when it leaves the sand on the side of the river that is dug during the
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dredging. Correct?
A. 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.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, just yes or no. When the Army Corps dredges, does it sometimes dispose of sand on the side of the river?
A. It may put them on point bars or on certain parts of the side of the river.
Q. 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?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, there is a photograph here on destruction of channel.
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MR. PRIMIS: And I would like to ask
Mr. Smith to blow that up.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Now, this photograph shows the Army Corps personnel digging up the river and putting sand on the side. Correct?
A. That's correct. The exact location of it I can't remember. Most of the time -- this had to be a very old photo because most of the time they primarily used what is called a hydraulic dredge, which means it literally took the sand and the water mixture, put it into a big pipe, which then went up to wherever it is they needed to put the material. And then the water and sand mixture was then placed in the designated disposal site with the appropriate boundaries on the upper and lower end. And they were, in fact, required to have berms that would prevent it from going into the floodplain.
Q. Sand disposal was not a good thing for the river. Correct?
A. That's why the State of Florida finally, after -since 1979 to 2005 finally ended it.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, sand disposal from dredging changes the habitat from highly productive ones to one of THE REPORTING GROUP
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the least productive habitats in the main channel. Correct?
A. 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.
Q. Mr. Hoehn --

MR. PRIMIS: Do we have Mr. Hoehn's deposition to refer to?

BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Mr. Hoehn, you gave a deposition in this case. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. 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.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Mr. Hoehn, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer?
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A. That is what I did. That's correct.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, one of -- now, going back to your chart --

MR. PRIMIS: We can take that picture
off.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. -- one -- in fact, one other form of destruction of the channel is increased erosion. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And one effect of increased erosion is also that it makes the channel deeper. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, each of these is caused by some form of conduct by the Army Corps of Engineers. Correct?
A. These were all ones that were done by dredging.
Q. Okay. Now, let's go to the next slide, which you have titled Damage in the Upper River to Biota. Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. One form of damage from the conduct that we were just talking about is that it limits the spawning areas for anadromous fish. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And those are fish that need to swim up the river from saltier water to spawn. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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A. They require freshwater to spawn. Correct.
Q. And you note here that access for the spawning areas was blocked by dams. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that's the Jim Woodruff Dam. True?
A. That is correct.
Q. And it blocked access for fish like the Gulf surgeon?
A. 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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
go through the lock, but tracking some of the sturgeon that the State of Georgia would then monitor to see whether or not they would, in fact, go back up to their natal grounds on the Flint River.

That was done this year. I have not seen the results. But it is an ongoing effort that we are cooperatively working to address.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, can you just focus on the questions that I'm asking. My question for you was did the dam block access to spawning areas that the sturgeon used to use?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. Did the dam also, as you point out here, reduce river habitats in size and quality?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. And the dam, you point out, also reduced mussel populations. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then the last point, the dam -- you would agree, wouldn't you, that it also degraded the floodplain forest?
A. Yes. In the upper part of the river; that's correct.
Q. Now, before we move to the other parts of the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
river, the next slide -- the next slide in your deck shows pictures of damage to habitats in the upper river. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. This slide shows dried-out riverbanks and floodplains; correct?
A. 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.
Q. 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?
A. 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.
Q. They could have also been caused by dredging. Correct?
A. Not here. There was no dredging.
Q. 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.

MR. PRIMIS: Can we zoom in on the THE REPORTING GROUP
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middle and lower.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. And, Mr. Hoehn, does that, what appears on your screen, look like the middle and lower river?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. I want to ask you questions about this section of the river now. And I believe if you go to the next page of your PowerPoint, you will see a slide called Damage to Middle/Lower River. Do you see that?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. The first form of damage you identified here was channel down-cutting 2 feet. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is --
A. At the time that this was done, it was estimated to about 2 feet.
Q. And that's additional lowering of the river in this section of the river. Correct?
A. At that point in time.
Q. Okay. And you point out also that another form of damage to the middle river and lower river was 25 miles of riverbank converted to sand. Correct?
A. That's correct.
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Q. And there has been a greatly reduced hydrologic connectivity in the middle river. Correct?
A. At this point in time, that's correct.
Q. Now, there are pictures on this slide, too.

MR. PRIMIS: Can we blow those up.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Okay. This picture shows piles of sand on the side of the Apalachicola River. Correct?
A. 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.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, I want to show you the other picture on the slide.
A. This bottom picture --
Q. 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?
A. Correct.
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Q. Okay. So let's go back to the other picture.

And this picture shows disconnection of an area that might otherwise be wetted. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And --
A. And I can't tell you exactly where that particular picture came from.
Q. There's sand and debris blocking the river channel from reaching that part of the riverbank or floodplain. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is this a slough, by the way?
A. Without -- without knowing exactly where the picture was taken, I can't tell you. It may be. I don't know.
Q. That's fine. Let's go back to the slide.

And the third bullet we focused on says that one form of damage was hydrologic connectivity is greatly reduced. Correct?
A. At the time that was correct.
Q. And that's what's depicted in the bottom right there where the water can't reach the floodplain?
A. Correct.
Q. Let's go to the next slide.

This slide is also called Damage to Middle THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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and Lower River. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. One form of damage that you identified was species abundance and composition declines on new sand habitats. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you also noted that threatened and endangered mussel abundance was lower and their distribution was limited. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then you go on to note that sloughs and floodplains are harmed from disconnection and sand. Correct?
A. That's correct. At the time --
Q. 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.
A. No.
Q. Did you have something to add?
A. Yes, I do. Because part -- one thing that -- and I appreciate your going through and looking at THE REPORTING GROUP
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all my slides here.
One thing that I must put in context here is that you indicated this was probably from around 2004, 2005 when this was done. Many of the effects that are depicted here are no longer there. They have been remedied. They are not in existence.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, we'll come back to that in a moment. Are you done with your answer now?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. The floodplain forest received less water inundation, correct, as a result of these activities?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And less water would make it into the floodplain because of that deeper channel. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And that harms the floodplain forest and the trees because they get less water when that happens. True?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let's go to the next slide, Harm to Valuable River Species. That's the next slide in your presentation?
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A. Yes.
Q. And among them that had been harmed was the Gulf sturgeon. Correct?
A. Gulf sturgeon, striped bass, and the federal T and $E$ mussels.
Q. 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?
A. 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.
Q. 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?
A. 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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the sand that was put into these permitted disposal sites has gone back into the system. And as such, when it has moved off of these disposal sites, it has elevated the bed of the river. It has, by our own FWC studies produced for the Corps of Engineers, indicated that we're starting to reclaim a lot of the species that would be normally occurring on the bank of the river that had received the sand. So without that sand being there, the river has started to -- within the banks started to recover. And, therefore, that's why I say much of what is in this dated presentation, the harm -- much of that harm that was attributable to the navigation dredging, it's nonexistent.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, you can't tell me how much of the effect of the dredging and the channelization has been fixed. Correct?

You don't know how much?
A. I'm not an expert in that. All I can tell is what $I$ have seen.
Q. Okay. I --
A. I can tell you that the three sites that received -- and I'm trying to remember approximately how many cubic yards; but one site THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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.
Q. 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?
A. Absolutely.
Q. 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. I cannot tell you, quantify it. I can tell you what I have observed.
Q. Now, Mr. Hoehn, I want to discuss with you your understanding of the term harm.

MR. PRIMIS: You can take the document THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart





```
that, quotes, the Corps operates the upstream
    dams and reservoirs that release water
        contributing to the flow of the Apalachicola
        River. Correct?
```

A. That is correct.
Q. And that was your sworn testimony in federal court?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about your sworn statement as it relates to Corps operations on the Gulf sturgeon. Can you go to page 8, and I'll direct you to paragraph 18.

You submitted sworn testimony to a federal court that said the Jim Woodruff Lock and Dam on the Apalachicola River completely precludes upstream Gulf sturgeon migration. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the Gulf sturgeon used to swim all the way into Georgia to spawn. Right?
A. As far as we knew, yes.
Q. But they can't do that anymore because of the dam. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, I think we established this before; but the Woodruff Dam causes entrenchment. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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## A. Correct.

Q. 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?
A. Correct.
Q. And it scours sediments below the dam; that's how it happens. Right?

The water comes over, and the sediments get washed away?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's what you were describing earlier in the PowerPoint presentation that we looked at. Right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, when the riverbed is lower, it takes more water to reach the same water level than before. I think we established that. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that phenomenon has had an impact on species. Correct?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. 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 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
years to provide a navigation channel. Right?
A. They did remove rocks in the river. That is correct. Whether or not they were sturgeon habitat, I cannot tell you.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, do you recall giving a deposition in the tri-state case, the one that we're looking at right now?
A. I know I gave -- yes.
Q. After you submitted your declaration, you gave a deposition in support of the preliminary injunction. Correct?
A. Correct.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, may I approach?
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. I'm handing you your deposition transcript from that case, sir.
A. Okay.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, can I refer you to page 145 , line 24 of this document, which I would also note has the same Northern District of Alabama case number. And it's document No. 414-3. And it's submitted in federal court filed on March 10, 2006.

Mr. Hoehn, you were asked on line 23, can you elaborate on habitat loss?

Your answer. Certainly. And I will be THE REPORTING GROUP
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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?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. 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?
A. Yes, I do. I wanted to read just a couple of the other paragraphs right before it just to --
Q. Take your time.
A. -- make sure I'm clear. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


Florida's lawsuit because you were trying to stop the, quote, potentially disastrous effects of Corps operation -- Corps reservoir operations on imperiled species in Florida. True?

Is that what it says in paragraph 39, sir?
A. Paragraph 39?
Q. Yes.

I'm sorry. I thought you were there.
A. I'm sorry. I wasn't.
Q. I'll ask a new question.

Would you agree that at paragraph 39 of your sworn testimony you referred to the potentially disastrous effects of Corps reservoir operations on imperiled species in Florida?
A. That is correct.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I see it's
$2: 45$. I'm at a natural break point, if you wanted to take the afternoon break, but I can also keep going. It's up to you.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It's up to you, counsel.

MS. WINE: Whatever works for him, I'm fine.

MR. PRIMIS: We'll keep going, if that's okay.
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BY MR. PRIMIS:
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.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the declaration we were just looking at was filed in support of this motion. Correct?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. 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?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at the brief supporting the motion. Do you see this was filed in January 31, 2006, at the back? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. January 31, correct.
Q. Okay. Let's take a look at page 3 of this brief.
A. I'm sorry. What page, sir?
Q. I'm looking at page 3, if you could.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. Now, in the first full paragraph, do you see about five lines down there's a reference to the Hoehn declaration?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. It says, see generally appendix, Exhibit B, Hoehn declaration. Correct?
A. Okay. Yes.
Q. And that's you. Right?
A. That's me.
Q. Okay. And your declaration is being cited for the proposition that precedes it, which says, Corps operations specifically harm three species protected under the ESA: The threatened Gulf sturgeon, the endangered fat threeridge, and the threatened purple bankclimber. Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And, in fact, your declaration was submitted to support that proposition. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you mentioned those same species as being THE REPORTING GROUP
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harmed in your testimony in this case. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. 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?
A. At that time that is exactly what it said.
Q. And your declaration is, again, cited in support of that proposition?
A. Yes.
Q. 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?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And it cites the federal defendant's answer to that proposition. Right?
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|  | 173 |  | 175 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. Correct. |  | 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 | A. That is in part what they alleged. | 4 | A. 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 | A. Correct. |
| 7 | sentence. It starts, as in the case of the Gulf | 7 | Q. 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 | A. Yes, I am. |
| 11 | mussels' habitat. | 11 | Q. Okay. You highlight Swift Slough in your direct |
| 12 | Do you see that? | 12 | testimony. Correct? |
| 13 | A. Yes, I do. | 13 | A. Correct. |
| 14 | Q. And Florida took that position in litigation | 14 | Q. You included pictures of Swift Slough? |
| 15 | against the Corps. True? | 15 | A. Yes. |
| 16 | A. Restate that. | 16 | Q. You have pictures of yourself at Swift Slough. |
| 17 | Q. Florida took that position in the litigation in | 17 | Correct? |
| 18 | which you filed your declaration. Correct? | 18 | A. I have many pictures of myself at Swift Slough |
| 19 | A. Yes. | 19 | and others. |
| 20 | Q. Florida further argued in the next sentence that | 20 | Q. And you submitted them to the United States |
| 21 | any adverse modification of mussel habitat would | 21 | Supreme Court so it could see what Swift Slough |
| 22 | likely jeopardize their continued existence. | 22 | looked like. Correct? |
| 23 | Right? | 23 | A. Yes. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | A. That's Fish and Wildlife Service -- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. | 24 | Q. You want this Court to know that something important happened at Swift Slough, Right? |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | important happened at Swift Slough. Right? <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 174 |  | 176 |
| 1 | Q. Right. And you understand Florida was advancing | 1 | A. Yes, sir. |
| 2 | at position in support | 2 | Q. Okay. So let's put up the map of the |
| 3 | A. Yes. | 3 | Apalachicola River from your page 5 of your |
| 4 | Q. -- of its case. Right? | 4 | testimony. And Swift Slough is in an area |
| 5 | A. Yes. | 5 | designated as lower nontidal reach. Correct? |
| 6 | Q. Now, Mr. Hoehn, each of those mussels still | 6 | A. Yes. |
| 7 | exist. Right? | 7 | If you would like and if it would assist your |
| 8 | A. Yes, they do. | 8 | Honor, the one on page 16 is a better map. |
| 9 | Q. This is 10 years later. Correct? | 9 | Q. That's the next one I have in my notes. |
| 10 | A. Correct. | 10 | MR. PRIMIS: Let's put up the slide on |
|  | Q. And now, Florida is making the same claim about | 11 | page 16. Mr. Smith, can you do that? |
| 12 | Georgia. Correct? | 12 | BY MR. PRIMIS: |
| 13 | A. Correct. | 13 | Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Hoehn, this is a map from your |
| 14 | Q. Let's turn to page 10, paragraph 11. Here | 14 | testimony. Correct? |
| 15 | Florida represented to the federal court in 2006 | 15 | A. Correct. |
| 16 | that, quote, the Corps operates a number of other | 16 | Q. It's from page 16? |
| 17 | facilities in the ACF Basin in addition to Buford | 17 | A. Yes, sir. |
| 18 | Dam and Lake Lanier. Do you see that? | 18 | Q. And Swift Slough is right around river marker 40. |
| 19 | A. Yes, I do. | 19 | Correct? |
| 20 | Q. And you understand that they're talking now about | 20 | A. It's close, yes. |
| 21 | the five dams that are on the Chattahoochee | 21 | Q. It is just south of the Wewahitchka Gage? |
| 22 | River. Correct? | 22 | A. It's about a mile south. |
| 23 | A. I'm talking about the reservoirs, yes. | 23 | MR. PRIMIS: And I'm sorry to the court |
| 24 | Q. Okay. And do you see at the end of that | 24 | reporter. I said I didn't have any trick |
| 25 | paragraph that Florida takes the position here in THE REPORTING GROUP | 25 | words, but Wewahitchka qualifies. We'll get THE REPORTING GROUP |
|  | Mason \& Lockhart |  | Mason \& Lockhart |


Q. One of the things she researched was the effect of channel change on inundation of floodplains in Apalachicola. Correct?
A. If you're referring to what $I$ consider the green document, which $I$ think is one of her later ones, yes.
Q. Okay. And Ms. Light is now a consultant for the State of Florida on this case. Correct?
A. She has been, yes.
Q. She sends her letter to Jerry Ziewitz. Who is Jerry Ziewitz?
A. At the time Jerry Ziewitz was -- forgive me. I don't remember if he was in charge of the listed species or section 7 group; but he is the person that I worked with throughout the Comprehensive Study, the Compact, dredging issues, everything associated with the Apalachicola River.
Q. Okay. Now, in the attachment to the e-mail that was originally from Ms. Light and then you forwarded it on, there's a letter from Marian Berndt, B E R N D T, to Jerry Ziewitz. Do you see that?
A. Okay. Yes.
Q. And it's dated July 13,2006 ?
A. Yes.
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Q. Okay. And the letter says, dear Mr. Ziewitz. In response to a request from you and Ted Hoehn, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Helen -- and Helen Light of our staff surveyed the controlling sill elevation of Swift Slough.

Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And it says that that survey was conducted on July 6, 2006. Right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Yes?
A. Correct.
Q. That's three days after the picture you took and submitted in your testimony in this court. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And it's true, Mr. Hoehn, that you did request the study that's referenced in this letter. Right?
A. I would have to -- have to assume that that is the case since it references a request from me. I don't remember doing it.
Q. But you don't dispute the statement from the acting office chief at the USGS that you
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requested this survey. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And, in fact, you went on the survey. True?
A. Correct.
Q. And this survey was clearly connected to your prior visit where you had seen those dead mussels three days earlier. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you say in the same -- this letter says in the same sentence that you provided field assistance to Ms. Light for the survey. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. So you were there when she was conducting the work that actually led to this report. Right?

## You watched it?

A. And all -- in going through this, I will have to -- I don't recall it; and -- but I know I went with her on many of these surveys. And I know I did one with her on Swift Slough, which took quite a bit of time.
Q. Now, I want to --
A. And if I may, sir?
Q. Yes. Go ahead.
A. In reading the letter, it does indicate that, yes, I was there.
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Q. Now, it says in the last sentence of the first paragraph that this survey was needed to estimate water depths in Swift Slough for various discharges higher than the disconnection flow. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the first paragraph had referred to a survey of the controlling sill elevation of Swift Slough. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And just in plain English, the controlling sill is the height that the water from the river needs to get over in order to inundate that slough. Right?
A. Simplistically, yes.
Q. I'll take it.

Thank you, Mr. Hoehn.
The -- so the survey was done to find out what river flow was needed to determine when Swift Slough would become disconnected from the river. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, on the last -- on the next to last page of this document -- and before we do that, let's go -- there's a report attached to the Helen THE REPORTING GROUP
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his testimony when I said that Swift Slough was a location that was impacted by channel erosion and lower water levels as a result of the historical channel alterations?
A. No.
Q. Now, were you aware that Dr. Kondolf submitted testimony that said Swift Slough is located in an area of the river that experienced significant historical dredging. Did you know that Florida submitted testimony on that here?
A. No, I'm not. But I believe I have already testified that that is -- precisely above that area is where there was significant dredging.
Q. Okay. So then you agree that Swift Slough has experienced significant historical dredging. Correct?
A. The area around Swift Slough, the main channel.
Q. That's right. Thank you for clarifying.
A. The main channel.
Q. Okay. So the main channel around Swift Slough has had significant historical dredging. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And sand put into circulation by the disturbance caused by dredging was deposited at Swift Slough. Right?
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A. Some sand has come into Swift Slough.
Q. So if Dr. Kondolf submitted that as his sworn testimony, you wouldn't disagree with that. Right?
A. I'm not the expert. Dr. Kondolf is.
Q. Well --
A. All I can tell you is $I$ have seen some sand in Swift Slough.
Q. You have?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when that sand is deposited in Swift Slough, it raises its bed elevation. Right?
A. In places.
Q. And it increases the flow needed to connect that slough to the main river. Right?
A. 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 THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
back to where that controlling sill is.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, do you agree or disagree with sworn testimony from Dr. Kondolf that the sand deposited in Swift Slough increased the flow needed to connect it to the main river?
A. I'm not the expert on that.
Q. You know that over six years the amount of water increased by 25 percent. Right?
A. But I can also look at the 1993, and it was not as much as that. So you have got a range between 4500 and 5100 to 5600 cfs at which flows are -were needed.
Q. Is --
A. And $I$ have no idea what it requires now.
Q. Mr. Hoehn, I'm talking about why the -- why the flow changed from 2000 to 2006. And you would agree with Dr. Kondolf it's because there was sand deposited there from dredging; wouldn't you?
A. Dr. Kondolf is the expert, not me.
Q. So, Mr. Hoehn, I want to stick with Swift Slough; but I want to show you another declaration that you signed. Okay?

Can you turn to tab 8 of your binder. And can you confirm that this is a declaration that you signed on November 1, 2007?
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## A. Yes.

Q. 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.)
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Q. And that's because of impacts of dredging, correct, according to Fish and Wildlife at least? True?
A. All I can say is that that's what they have indicated is, you know, yes, it was an area of significant dredging. So that's what they said.
Q. In 2016. True?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, let's go back to your declaration, Mr. Hoehn. Can you turn --

MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, do you have that? It's tab 8.

Tab 8.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. I want to turn, if you would, Mr. Hoehn, to paragraph 10. Actually, before I do, just to set the stage, this declaration on the front page has a caption called In Re: Tri-State Water Rights Litigation. Do you see that on the first page of your declaration?
A. Oh, I'm sorry. You're -- wait a minute. Is this -- all right. You're on a different one. So what tab am I on?
Q. Tab 8 .
A. Tab 8.
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Q. Okay.
A. And this one is -- and, again, forgive me on this because I have a different way of trying to remember which one of these cases were ones that were filed. This is the Middle District Court of Florida. Correct?
Q. Correct.
A. Which was in the -- the way $I$ remember it, it was more dealing with the listed species.
Q. This one certainly does.
A. Okay.
Q. And, Mr. Hoehn, you understand that the Alabama case that you had previously signed a declaration in, that that was combined in a multi-district litigation into this tri-states case. Do you know that?
A. Yeah. I mean, it's -- the way -- the way -again, this is why I'm asking these questions is there were so many cases put out there individually that were then combined. So I have to try and compartmentalize them.
Q. Okay. So this is your November 1, 2007, declaration. And I would like to turn your attention to paragraph 10. And in paragraph 10, you stated in this sworn declaration that part of THE REPORTING GROUP
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your job includes coordinating with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other Commission staff to protect and recover species listed under the Endangered Species Act. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And these species you say include two freshwater mussels, the fat threeridge and the purple bankclimber?
A. Correct.
Q. And then in paragraph 11 -- and this is, again, in tab 8 -- you state in the second sentence, other than Fish and Wildlife's activities, you are perhaps most familiar with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' activities. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you understood that to be a true statement when you swore to it. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Then you say the Corps' operations impact dramatically the well-being of the Apalachicola River ecosystem because the Corps operates the dams and reservoirs, e.g., Lake Lanier and Buford Dam, that release water into the Apalachicola River.

And you included that in your sworn THE REPORTING GROUP
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testimony. Correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, in paragraph 16 on page 5 of your declaration -- I'll give you a minute to get there.
A. Okay.
Q. You reference an entity called EnviroScience. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's a consulting firm that you worked with in evaluating the mussel die-off in Swift Slough. Correct?
A. They actually reviewed and did surveys all up and down the river in 2005. They did surveys all up and down the river, and Swift Slough was one that were done. And they also established some long-term, what we call tagging sites on the mainstem.
Q. And just to make sure we have a clear question and answer, EnviroScience, among its other responsibilities, conducted a survey of Swift Slough in 2005. Correct?
A. As far as $I$ recollect, yes.
Q. And in paragraph 16 , the last sentence, you participated directly in reviewing THE REPORTING GROUP
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|  | 213 |  | 215 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | attached to. That's in tab 9. | 1 | Q. 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 | A. 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 | A. 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 | A. If -- |
| 9 | Phase 2 Claims? | 9 | Q. You can refresh yourself if you want. |
| 10 | A. Yes, I do. | 10 | A. 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 | A. I will accept that. |
| 13 | A. If -- okay. I'm just trying to read the | 13 | Q. 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 | Q. If I told you Phase 1 was water supply and | 17 | Service. You understand that; right? |
| 18 | Phase 2 was species, would you take my word for | 18 | A. Yes, I do. |
| 19 | it? | 19 | Q. Okay. In this sentence the State of Florida says |
| 20 | A. 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 | A. Correct. |
| 25 | was the 2006 mussel die-off in Swift Slough. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | Q. And you know Florida took that position in this THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 214 |  | 216 |
| 1 | Right? | 1 | litigation against the Corps. Right? |
| 2 | A. 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 | A. 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 | 8 | BY MR. PRIMIS: |
| 9 | and 2007 during Corps operations under prior | 9 | Q. And turning to the last paragraph on page 48, |
| 10 | Service-approved versions of the IOP. Do you see | 10 | would you agree with me, Mr. Hoehn, that in this |
| 11 | that? | 11 | submission to the United States Federal District |
| 12 | A. That's correct. | 12 | Court, the State of Florida said the following: |
| 13 | Q. And the IOP you know to be the Interim Operating | 13 | With the Service's approval, the Corps reduced |
| 14 | Plan? | 14 | flows in the Apalachicola River to 5,000 cfs for |
| 15 | A. Correct. | 15 | extended periods during 2006 and 2007, and killed |
| 16 | Q. That's the Army Corps' -- at the time their | 16 | essentially all of the mussels in Swift Slough. |
| 17 | operating plan for the reservoirs and dams. | 17 | Do you see that? |
| 18 | Right? | 18 | A. Yes, I do. |
| 19 | A. That was correct. | 19 | Q. And you would agree with me that the State of |
| 20 | Q. Okay. The next sentence -- in the next sentence | 20 | Florida told the federal court that the Army |
| 21 | the State of Florida represents to the federal | 21 | Corps killed essentially all of the mussels in |
| 22 | Court in that case that among the mussel species | 22 | Swift Slough in 2006 and 2007. True? |
| 23 | impacted was the entire population of Swift | 23 | A. That's -- that is correct. |
| 24 | Slough. Did I read that correctly? | 24 | Q. Now, I want to put back up that picture that you |
| 25 | A. That's correct. | 25 | have in your direct testimony, that terrible |
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|  |  | 221 |  |  | 223 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | not require dredging because, as you can see, | 1 |  | 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 |  | Yes, we have. You know, the first things that, |
| 4 |  | sinuosity, or bends, in the river. | 4 |  | you know, we tried to deal with were in the upper |
| 5 |  | And so it's -- I know it's hard for everybody to | 5 |  | part of the river, although it isn't due to |
| 6 |  | 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 | A. | 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 |  | And on about how many miles of the river did the | 14 |  | where, because of low water and the lack of |
| 15 |  | dredging occur? | 15 |  | recreational use and fishery habitat at -- during |
| 16 | A. | It varied from year to year. But we could always | 16 |  | low water, we went in and did a multimillion |
| 17 |  | 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 |  | And so if I'm following your math, that's about | 23 |  | Do you know what the term dredge spoil disposal |
| 24 |  | 2 to 3 miles roughly of the river? | 24 |  | means? |
| 25 |  | Correct. Where they had the vast majority every | 25 |  | Yes, $I$ do. |
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|  |  | 222 |  |  | 224 |
| 1 |  | year. | 1 | Q. | And has Florida done any -- why don't you tell us |
| 2 |  | And what is the length of the entire Apalachicola | 2 |  | what that is. Sorry. |
| 3 |  | River? | 3 | A. | Dredge spoil disposal is, as I indicated to the |
| 4 |  | 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 |  | And you mentioned earlier that Florida killed th | 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 |  | 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 | A. | 2005 | 11 |  | ocean as a sandbar. So I'm -- if you will grant |
| 12 |  | And has any dredging occurred since 2005? | 12 |  | me that clarification. |
| 13 |  | 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 |  | 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 | A. | Correct. | 20 |  | flows so that at high flows the water would take |
| 21 | Q. | Okay. Rough | 21 |  | the sand away and keep it within the -- within |
| 22 | A. | Give or take a year. | 22 |  | the system. |
| 23 | Q. | Roughly 15 years ago? | 23 |  | And has -- what has happened to the dredge spoil |
| 24 | A. | Correct. | 24 |  | disposal now, to bring ourselves current? |
| 25 |  | And has Florida done anything to restore the | 25 | A. | As I indicated, you know, we have got many of |
|  |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
|  |  | Mason \& Lockhart |  |  | Mason \& Lockhart |




```
low flows, ones that historically we have never
    seen, that is a harm to the system.
Q. And in what way do low flows harm the
    Apalachicola River system?
        And if it's easier to break it out into the
        different reaches of the river, that's fine.
        Whatever is easier for you, sir.
A. In the upper reach, you know, I have indicated that --
THE WITNESS: You know, if I may, sir, I'll kind of point these out because these are the important ones here.
A. These primarily -- these right in here are spring runs. And those are, again, cited by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as part of, you know, restoration and planned recovery of the sturgeon and are extremely important, you know, because they supply cool water. The same with the striped bass.
As you move further south -- and let me also back up. You also have bank habitat in the upper river. The upper river is really -- and, in fact, the entire river you can kind of -- the reason why it's broken up into all these various reaches is because it changes in its form.
THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
```

[^0]is its largest tributary. And as it comes in, you know, the floodplain is widening out.

And so here, you know, we're -- we're seeing changes in -- this is the -- this is the Corps area where the Service has done most of their work. But this -- this is where we're starting to see the widening of the floodplain and, you know, where we get a lot of -- a wide variety of species.

And then it starts hitting the tidal reach where, again, you're getting 6 miles of floodplain that goes all the way through there.
Q. And, sir, how is it that persistent and extreme low flows are impacting the Apalachicola River today?
A. When you start -- top to bottom, you start losing these habitats. You start losing where fish spawn. You lose where many of the turtles, they're not able to climb up these steep banks in order to nest up in some of the sandy or floodplain areas because, you know, some of them, they're this big. And they can't climb up all this area.

We're seeing changes in the within-bank habitat where a lot of mussels -- and it's not THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
just the endangered ones. In one of my slides $I$ have got, you know, some pictures of where -- and I mentioned this earlier -- where we had long-term tagging at river mile 46.9. It's got what is called a hook and bay system where you have got the river coming down and then a semi point bar; but it's not -- it's a straightaway, and it comes down. And the mussels are typically found on this, you know, out of the current, into the sand, on top of the sand, and back behind. And when low flow happens, all of the mussels -they have a brain; but their brain is really, where is water?

And so, yes, they can move. And I was quite 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 --
Q. And have you seen a change in the pattern of low flows over the last decade or two?
A. Absolutely. We have -- since 2000 even we have THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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seen more frequent, longer term extreme low flows, close to $\mathbf{5 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{c f s}$, than we ever have in the historical record.

MS. WINE: Your Honor, if I may, this might be a good breaking point for today.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry, counsel?

MS. WINE: It's 4:30. I was just saying this might be a good breaking point for today, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It's fine by me.

MS. WINE: Thank you.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry about it for you.

THE WITNESS: I'm here at your pleasure.
(Time Noted: 4:34 p.m.)
(Proceeding adjourned to Tuesday, November 1, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.)
(End of day)

-     -         -             -                 - 

/s/ Claudette G. Mason
Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR
Court Reporter
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[^0]:    Q. Do you need a minute, sir?
    A. The upper river has very steep sides, very narrow floodplain, which is green. The banks there are very susceptible to changes in flow. And we have got various species that -- that are only found in that particular reach that are in that little area, that within-bank area.

    The middle reach, as the river is coming down, it starts to flatten out. You know, upper reach, it's coming fairly quickly. It's starting to flatten out. It's in what used to be the historic seashore. It's very much sand. And so this is where you're starting to get a lot of the changes and sinuosity. And you're starting to 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 influence of flow from the Chipola River, which THE REPORTING GROUP
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