
testimony that you submitted in this case.
Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if we can just take a look at that, do you still have that in front of you along with the binder?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So for the moment, if you can just put your prefiled direct testimony in front of you dated October 26, 2016.
A. Yes.

Let me move some of these down. I hope that didn't make any noise on the microphone.
Q. Do you have that in front of you?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And if you could, sir, please turn to page 1 of that document. And, sir, you will see first in paragraph 3 you say that your testimony will describe the beauty and the majesty of the river, its floodplain, and its habitats. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then you go in paragraph 4, sir, to say that your testimony will address how adequate river flows and floodplain connectivity are essential THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

277
to maintain the health of the many unique habitats within the Apalachicola and the species that depend on those habitats?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And what do you mean by that, whatever you were referencing when you say adequate river flows and floodplain connectivity?
A. Without flowing water, the fish, wildlife, and the habitat will not survive. Water is the lifeblood. Without -- without water, it's like we cannot breathe. And so that is why, you know, during low flows it's exceedingly important that we have enough water to cover these habitats to provide for the full range of species that inhabit both the river and the floodplain.
Q. And that same topic, the impact of low flows on the Apalachicola River, was also the focus of your two prior declarations that Georgia's counsel showed you yesterday; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And if we -- if you could take your binder now that counsel gave you yesterday, and if you could, sir, turn to tab 5. And that is the declaration that you submitted in 2006 in the Alabama litigation.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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Let me know when you're there, sir.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And if you could just look at the first page of that declaration in paragraph 2, the second sentence, just confirming what you just stated that the purpose of this declaration is to explain how certain flows in the Apalachicola River impact species reliant for various life functions on the Apalachicola River and Bay ecosystems. Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And what did you mean by that?
A. Once again, you know, it is the flows that are needed to preserve and protect the full suite of all the habitats of all the species that occur within the Apalachicola River and Bay system.
Q. And, sir, now, if you could turn to tab 8 in
the binder that Georgia gave you yesterday. And tab 8 is the declaration that you submitted in the tri-state water case in Florida in 2007. And when you're there, sir, if you could, I want to direct you this time to page 6, paragraph 20. And there, sir -- are you there?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. There, sir, you say at the start of paragraph 20 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


|  | 280 | 282 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. We have seen substantial drying of bank habitat. | 1 |  | Do you recall that questioning? |
| 2 | We have seen substantial mortality of a full | 2 |  | Yes, I do. |
| 3 | range of mussel species up and down the system. | 3 |  | And, sir, have you ever stated in these |
| 4 | We have seen drying of the sloughs, some that, | 4 |  | declarations or otherwise that the Army Corps |
| 5 | you know, hadn't gone dry before. We have seen | 5 |  | operations are the only cause of low flows to the |
| 6 | changes in the -- and if you need an explanation, | 6 |  | Apalachicola River? |
| 7 | I can give it -- but in year classes of various | 7 |  | No. |
| 8 | fish that we have been monitoring for over 10 | 8 |  | And what else can impact the flow of water to the |
| 9 | years. And we have seen the decrease in those | 9 |  | Apalachicola River? |
| 10 | populations of those year classes. We have seen | 10 |  | The flows into the Apalachicola River are |
| 11 | species of trees that are more tolerant of upland | 11 |  | governed by both the Corps operations of the |
| 12 | conditions migrating into the floodplain. And we | 12 |  | dams, but also as -- going back into the -- into, |
| 13 | have also seen parts of the floodplain that used | 13 |  | you know, the early '80's, Florida and my |
| 14 | to be wide open that would be muddy or, you know, | 14 |  | observations and participations in various |
| 15 | full of cypress trees starting to come up with | 15 |  | meetings have always indicated and focused on |
| 16 | grasses, which is not usual in a floodplain. | 16 |  | consumptive use in the upstream portions of the |
| 17 | Q. And, sir, these observations and these extreme | 17 |  | basin, which include, as we used to call in the |
| 18 | low flows have all occurred since Florida stopped | 18 |  | Comprehensive Study, the pipes, which is |
| 19 | the dredging activities in 2000 -- well, around | 19 |  | municipal and industrial demand, and agriculture, |
| 20 | 2000 and then officially in 2005. Correct? | 20 |  | agricultural irrigation. And both of these |
| 21 | A. That is correct. | 21 |  | significantly impact the amount of water that is |
| 22 | Q. And it's all occurred during the period that the | 22 |  | available to come down into the Apalachicola |
| 23 | river has otherwise shown recovery from those | 23 |  | stem. |
| 24 | prior Corps activities. Correct? | 24 | Q. | And, sir, where does the water come down from |
| 25 | MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm -- your | 25 |  | into the Apalachicola River system? |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
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| 281 |  | 283 |  |  |
| 1 | Honor. | 1 |  | If it would be helpful to use the map, please |
| 2 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes? | 2 |  | feel free. |
| 3 | MR. PRIMIS: Sorry to interrupt. I have | 3 |  | That one might not show it precisely. |
| 4 | been patient, but the -- counsel is leading; | 4 | A. | Yes. |
| 5 | and I object. | 5 | Q. | We had another one up yesterday as well. |
| 6 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel? | 6 |  | But the best you can describe for the Special |
| 7 | MS. WINE: Can I continue? | 7 |  | Master, where are the sources of water that are |
| 8 | Sir, I'm just recounting testimony that | 8 |  | flowing into the Apalachicola River? |
| 9 | he gave yesterday. I'm just trying to move | 9 | A. | The Chattahoochee, which starts in the mountains |
| 10 | things along. He testified yesterday that | 10 |  | of north Georgia, which flows through Atlanta and |
| 11 | the dredging activity stopped | 11 |  | goes through the federal reservoirs and then |
| 12 | officially in 2005. The actual activity had | 12 |  | joins along the Florida, Georgia, Alabama line |
| 13 | actually stopped in 2000. And I'm just going | 13 |  | over on the west. And then you have the Flint |
| 14 | through that again with him. | 14 |  | River which, if you look at Lake Seminole and how |
| 15 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Proceed. | 15 |  | it's going -- kind of going off to the east, the |
| 16 | MS. WINE: Thank you. | 16 |  | Flint River actually starts just south of the |
| 17 | BY MS. WINE: | 17 |  | Atlanta Regional Airport and then flows down |
| 18 | Q. Now, Georgia's counsel yesterday directed you to | 18 |  | through the State of Georgia. They combine to -- |
| 19 | language in your prior declaration where you said | 19 |  | right here at Lake Seminole to form the |
| 20 | that the Corps operations have the potential to | 20 |  | Apalachicola River. |
| 21 | impact dramatically and directly the well-being | 21 |  | And the federally operated dams that we have been |
| 22 | of the river ecosystem because the Corps operates | 22 |  | talking about, which river are they along? |
| 23 | upstream dams and reservoirs that release water | 23 | A. | They're along the Chattahoochee. |
| 24 | contributing to the flow of the Apalachicola | 24 |  | And are there any federally operated dams along |
| 25 | River. | 25 |  | the Flint River? |
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A. None.
Q. So what happens from any unconsumed water that's flowing down the Flint River? Where does it go?
A. It comes straight into Lake Seminole. And then, because Jim Woodruff is what is considered a run of the river, which means whatever comes in, goes out, it comes into Lake Seminole and then will come into the Apalachicola River.
Q. So any unconsumed water from the Flint River comes straight into the Apalachicola River?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, I think you just said that historically you and others in Florida have been focused on Georgia's consumptive use in addition to Corps operations when talking about flows into the Apalachicola River; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And what do you recall about meetings or other events dating back to the early '80's, I think you just said, where you and Florida were focused on Georgia's consumptive use?
A. In the 1980's we had -- and this is when I first started; and it was, you know, only for a brief amount of time, there was a -- what was then called a 308 study, which was the precursor to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the Comprehensive Study and Compact which looked
at what to do during droughts and how water could
be adjusted and, again, conserved in the upstream basin to provide water for everyone's needs. Again, it was pre-Compact. It failed.

In 1989, 1990, which is when we started the Alabama case and then the Comprehensive Study, the main focus of that was what is being used, what is being consumed. And, you know, that took up, I would say, a good 60 to 75 percent of almost every single meeting.
Q. And, sir, you have mentioned the Comprehensive Study and then the ACF Compact. Because we're still at the start of this litigation, can you just tell us all what the ACF Compact was?
A. The ACF Compact actually was signed. It was an agreement by the three states with the federal government -- and there is a term for it, which I cannot remember; but it was Mr. Lindsey represented the federal government in the meetings where the three states decided that it was in their best interests to try and come up with an equitable apportionment of water for the entire system.

> One of the things that -- when we started the THE REPORTING GROUP
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process, we looked at all the other basin
Commissions around the country and decided we really didn't want to have litigation. And so there was an open-ended allocation formula that was to be determined. And that was the sticking point. And the States tried and could not come up with an agreeable allocation formula, at which point the Compact ended.
Q. And, sir, you participated in these Compact negotiations?
A. I was not a direct member of the negotiating team.
Q. What was your role in connection with the Compact negotiations?
A. My role was strictly as various proposals were developed by the three states, including Florida, is to take a look at what was being proposed and then coordinate our agency's review to determine what the biological effects of whatever the proposal was and provide that back to the negotiators.
Q. And do you recall approximately what time period over which these negotiations took place?
A. Precisely, no.
Q. Roughly late '90's, early 2000's? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. They would have been in -- let's see. The Compact ran, I think, for five years; so that would have been mid-'90's to early 2000, somewhere in that time frame, give or take a couple years.
Q. And you recall that Georgia's upstream consumption was part of these Compact negotiations?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Now, sir, before we leave this topic, I just want to make sure one thing is clear. Having looked at the prior declarations you submitted in the earlier litigations, do you think that any of the statements you made in those declarations or otherwise are in any way inconsistent with the assertion here that Georgia's consumption is contributing to the persistent and extreme low flows on the Apalachicola River?

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I just want to place a leading objection.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sustained.
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Sir, having looked at the prior declarations that you submitted in those earlier litigations, is there anything that is of concern to you as you THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

and 9 and 10, it talks about the need to address upstream impacts from both municipal, agricultural, and industrial water users and to reduce those consumptive uses to develop drought response strategies. Further, to minimize water consumption, thus minimizing detrimental effects to the species. And then as the last bullet indicates, to work as part of system operations to include estimates of basin inflow and consumptive demands.
Q. Thank you.

Now, sir, yesterday you were asked a number of questions regarding the mussel populations
that are addressed in this 2016 biological
opinion. And you stated that Florida is continuing to investigate and monitor the status of those mussels. Why is that?
A. The State of Florida has initiated over the past two years long-term monitoring of all the mussel species in various rivers. It started over in the Suwannee River system to the east of the Apalachicola and has moved into the Apalachicola system over the past two years.

And, again, the long-term monitoring program is much like what we do in fisheries research is THE REPORTING GROUP
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to see what is happening with the full suite of species that occur within the system and to help identify changes in populations or changes in abundance of a particular species or suite of species, and then, if we do see changes, to then look at, you know, with other people, why this is happening.
Q. And are there still threats to the mussel species on the Apalachicola River?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are those due to?
A. The primary threat right now is low flow. And as part of that low flow that is not just related to the common species, but is identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, it is upstream consumptive use.
Q. Now, yesterday you were also talked -- asked about harm to the Gulf sturgeon. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was a lot of discussion about harm to their spawning ground area. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Are there other harms to the Gulf sturgeon other than the harms you discussed yesterday
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surrounding their spawning areas?
A. Yes.
Q. And what are those?
A. The time between when the eggs hatch and they're barely free-swimming, which is called young of the year, or, you know, during the age one time period, it's somewhat of a black box that no one really knows exactly what's happening with these species. But what we do know is that they will migrate down to the delta and the distributaries down towards Apalachicola Bay.

And they are extremely intolerant of higher salinities. So when they are down there feeding, if you have low flows, salinities in those distributaries increase, it can kill those first-year sturgeon.

The other aspect that there is potential harm is what is happening after they reach that first-year time period. And what we are finding right now is that they seem to be -- and this is brand new research that is going on -- they seem to be holding in a particular part of the river that is a loop stream, which I described yesterday, that if you don't get enough flow through that loop stream, then, once again, you THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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have changes in the habitat within that area.
Q. Now, sir, you were also asked yesterday about

Swift Slough. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in particular you were asked about changes in the controlling sill at Swift Slough?
A. Correct.
Q. Sir, do you know what a geomorphologist is?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. That is a person who has expertise in looking at rivers and looking at how the river moves back and forth and what happens with the sedimentation. That's my layman's term.
Q. And just so I make sure I'm on the same page, would a geomorphologist look at sill levels?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're not a geomorphologist. Correct?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. And do you understand that Florida has an expert in geomorphology testifying in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. And who is that?
A. Dr. Mat Kondolf.
Q. All right. Now, you have seen yourself Swift THE REPORTING GROUP
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you would change to run different scenarios in terms of assumptions about, for example, number of acres irrigated.
Q. Okay. So if I understand your testimony, there were long-held understandings about the various types of things that would be input into the models, but not about the volume or amount of each of those inputs. Correct?
A. Right. And, again, not trying to be difficult, sir, but the long-held understanding was that you had to understand what the limits were on water consumption and how much of that water would be returned to the system and how that would affect the state line. So that was the fundamental long-held understanding.

There were also understandings about assumptions, if you will, about number of acres irrigated, municipal and industrial water consumption, drought indexes, and that sort of thing.
Q. Okay. Now, these long established understandings, you weren't around when they were first discussed. Correct?
A. When they were first discussed --
Q. They predated you. Right?
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A. Of course.
Q. You came seven years after these discussions occurred?
A. Yes.
Q. And you also weren't around when the Compact was signed. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So let's actually look at the Compact. It's in FX-209 in your book. It's the second tab.
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm going to refer you to the language in subsection (e) on page 4.

And I will confess this is not the easiest print to read, so we will blow it up on the screen.

## Are you there?

A. Well, I am; but -- maybe I'm not. What page are you on, sir?
Q. Page 4. Article VI -- Article -- I'm sorry, Article VII.
A. Okay.
Q. Subpart (e). And I just want to -- this is just --
A. I'm with you now. My pagination must be different than yours; but I do have it, yes.
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Q. I just want to establish quickly that one term of this Compact that the States had agreed to was that it shall not commit any state to agree to any data generated by any study or commit any state to any allocation formula not acceptable to such state. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that was one of the terms that the parties agreed to when they entered into this Compact. True?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And that was one of the terms that Florida agreed to when it entered into this Compact. True?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, some of your testimony concerns something called a dry year multiplier. Do you remember that?
A. I do.
Q. And you said that shortly after negotiations began, Georgia proposed a dramatically higher dry year multiplier than had been contemplated by the parties to the Comprehensive Study. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you turn to GX-1266 in your book. It's about four from the back. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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A. Okay. Thank you. Yes.
Q. Is 1266 a memo that you received in May of 1999 when you were secretary?
A. It is.
Q. This memorandum provides you with an update on ACF technical work group meeting that took place on April 30, 1999. Correct?
A. It is.
Q. And all three states were in attendance. Right?
A. I believe so. It appears to be.
Q. Now, you were told that Doug Barr was in attendance on behalf of Florida. Right? In that second paragraph.
A. Yes.
Q. And Doug Barr made a presentation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- right?

And you know that Doug Barr was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he served on Florida's technical team for Compact negotiations?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, he told you in here in the next -- in the
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bottom of that second paragraph that Georgia had
    proposed a 2.5 dry year multiplier for water
    demands. Correct?
A. Yes. That's in the memo.
Q. And in that -- in that proposal, it was
estimating that Georgia would use 2-1/2 times
more water in a dry year than in an average year.
Right?
A. Well, yes. It says right here the use of a 2.5
multiplier.
Q. Right. And that means you're going to use two
and a half times more water when it's dry than
when it's normal or wet. Right?
That's what Georgia was proposing?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, in this memo you were told that neither Florida nor Alabama's proposals included a dry year multiplier. True?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the next paragraph, Doug Barr says that Georgia's 2.5 times multiplier is unacceptable to Florida. Right?
A. That's right.
Q. And Florida's official position at the time was that no dry year multiplier was appropriate.
THE REPORTING GROUP
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True?
A. It does not say that.
Q. Well, in the prior paragraph it says, neither the Florida nor Alabama proposal included a dry year multiplier. Right?
```

A. I think there is a difference between a proposal and an official position.
Q. Oh, there is?

Okay. Let's explore that. At this time neither Florida nor Alabama proposed a dry year multiplier. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you were also told by Mr. Barr that privately, Florida's technical team agreed that a dry year multiplier was correct -- was required. Correct?
A. Yes. It says right here that a multiplier is required for dry years.
Q. In the bottom of the paragraph it says, they strongly believe -- referring to Georgia -- that a multiplier is required for dry years.

Right?
A. That's right.
Q. And then Mr. Barr then says, privately we agree.
A. Right.
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Q. That's exactly right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you did agree privately. Right?
A. Well, actually, if I can put this in context, $I$ received a memo from staff getting briefed on the meeting. They relayed to me through this memo, as you can plainly see, that privately they agreed that there should be a dry year multiplier. Subsequent to this, in fact, the State did publicly and, quote-unquote, officially agree that there should be a dry year multiplier.
Q. And at this point in time in May of '99, Florida had a private belief that it was appropriate; but it wasn't included in its proposal. And it told Georgia that it was not appropriate. True?
A. Just one moment.

That's not exactly right. If you actually read the first sentence of the third paragraph, it says, Doug stated that the value of the multiplier and the number of years that it is applied were unacceptable to Florida. It doesn't say that Doug said that a dry year multiplier was, in fact, unacceptable.
Q. He indicates in the last two sentences that Georgia believes it's required for dry years. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart And privately, we agree. True? Is that what he told you?
A. Well, first of all, the memo is not from Doug; it's from DEP staff reflecting what Doug said at the meeting. So --
Q. With that clarification, is that what you were told, that Florida had a private position that they agreed that a dry year multiplier was necessary?

In this memorandum that we're looking at.
A. This memorandum was staff explaining to me that their position or their belief was that we should agree to a dry year multiplier. Based on that recommendation, in fact Florida did agree to include a dry year multiplier in the context of the Compact negotiations, and always did.
Q. Now, Georgia changed its position on the dry year multiplier, too. Right?
A. Every party changed all their positions frequently over the course of six years.
Q. Georgia reduced the multiplier that it asked for from 2.5 to 1.8. Correct?
A. Are you referring specifically to a reference in the memo?
Q. Well, is it in your testimony that Georgia
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A. I do.
Q. And it says, in the end Florida was unable to accept only minimum flows, plus whatever else the upstream states were not able to consume or store. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And that's an accurate quote from you. Correct?
A. It is
Q. And right above that there is another quote from you; and it says, I believe that over time with the impartial oversight of our highest court we will be able to better protect our river and bay than to compromise further. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And that quote is accurate as well. Right?
A. Very accurate.
Q. You mentioned filing suit in the Supreme Court in that quote. Right?
A. Say it again, please.
Q. You're talking about filing a lawsuit on behalf of the State of Florida in the highest court, which is the Supreme Court of the United States. Correct?
A. That is correct. Yes.
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Q. Okay. Florida did not sue Georgia in the Supreme Court in 2003 when this Compact expired. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Florida didn't sue Georgia for the next 10 years --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- with the United States Supreme Court. Correct?
A. Obviously.
Q. Florida did sue the Army Corps of Engineers.

Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But it waited a decade before filing this lawsuit. True?
A. That's right.

MR. PRIMIS: No further questions. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. WINE:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Struhs.
A. Good morning.
Q. Oh, it's still morning. Sorry. We had a break.

Good morning, Mr. Struhs.
A. Good morning.
Q. In 1999 when you took your position, how did you
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become familiar with the ACF Compact?
A. I was briefed by staff from the Department of Environmental Protection and also from technical staff from the Northwest Florida Water Management District.
Q. And did you do anything to educate yourself in terms of what led up to the formation of the ACF Compact?
A. Yes, I did. I visited the river extensively and the communities around it. I read the Comprehensive Study that preceded the Compact. I read the Compact agreement itself. And I received memorandums and verbal briefings regarding the status of those negotiations under the Compact.
Q. And how much time did you personally devote to
the Compact negotiations?
A. A significant amount. I would say that looking back at my tenure as the Secretary of the Agency, this item probably consumed the second greatest amount of my time. Everglades restoration was probably the first, and this was the second. So it captured a lot of $\mathbf{m y}$ time and attention.
Q. And did you want to see the Compact succeed?
A. Yes.
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Q. Georgia's counsel just referenced state line minimum flows in his last set of questioning. Do you recall that?

He was referring to an article that referenced --
A. Yes.
Q. -- state line flows?
A. That's right.
Q. And what is your understanding of a state line flow in the context of the Compact negotiations?
A. Right. So it was a measurement of water at the gage at the state line, the Chattahoochee Gage, which was the confluence of the Flint River and the Chattahoochee River to the north and formed the Apalachicola. So that was the measuring point for determining state line flows.
Q. And was Florida prepared to agree to a state line minimum flow as a metric for allocating water use during the Compact negotiations?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. And why not?
A. Because the -- the very nature of the healthy
functioning ecosystem that we were seeking to preserve and protect requires a natural flow regime, a variable flow regime, both in terms of THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
magnitude, frequency, duration that in turn would affect the temperature, the salinity, the nutrients, the reach of the water up to different levels of the bank, and in maintaining as much as possible that that natural hydrograph that was essential to maintaining the underlying health and sustainability of that ecosystem.

So we were adamant that a system of minimum flows would, over the course of time with increased water consumption likely to occur in the north, lead to those minimum flows becoming in effect management targets, which would lead to the decimation of the ecosystem.
Q. And what was your view of what was needed, if not an agreement on minimum state line flows?
A. Well, so if you look at different hydrographs in terms of what we were trying to approximate in terms of a natural flow regime, there would be certain floors in that hydrograph; and those would be minimum flows. The desire and insistence of Florida all along was that those minimum flows would be very, very rare occurrences. And when they did occur, they would occur for only a very short duration.
Q. And did you communicate this to the State of THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Georgia during the Compact negotiations?
A. Many times.
Q. And did you propose something other than just a state minimum flow for the parties to consider?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And what was that?
A. Well, we -- again, we -- our technical staff began with a period of record of 50 years of weather data so we would know the historical flows. We would then build into our assumptions certain caps on consumption of water. We would build in certain assumptions in terms of some of that consumed water being returned to the river system. And we would then determine how that over time would affect the results at that state line gage.
Q. And if consumption caps were built into these proposals, in your view why didn't the parties talk about consumption caps publicly?
A. Georgia -- Georgia's representatives made very clear to us on more than one occasion that the negotiations would have a greater chance of being successful if they did not have to publicly talk about caps on consumption. And if you can -- if you don't mind, I'll just explain why we were THE REPORTING GROUP
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able to accommodate that even though everybody knew every step of the way that consumption caps were built into the model.

There's the amount of water that weather gives us. There's the amount of water that's consumed from the system. And then there's a certain portion of that water that is then returned to the system. Those three things together then determine what that state line flow is.

So in -- for purposes of political harmony and trying to increase the chance of a negotiated settlement, we allowed ourselves to avoid speaking publicly about consumption caps per se. But as long as we could talk about the state line flow and the net consumption or the returns, we were able to essentially have the same effect. They were -- there were consumption caps by a different name for purposes of political commenting.
Q. And if you have the binder still in front of you, Georgia's counsel directed you to Exhibit FX-199.
A. Just one moment.
Q. Yes. Those are the statements --
A. Yes.
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Q. -- from the March 18, 2002, ACF River Basin Commission meeting. Are you there, sir?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And if you turn to the second page and go to the sentence in the second paragraph that states, of course, as I just described, nobody expected to place any limits on water consumption in Georgia. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you explain -- well, in your view, is that testimony -- is that sentence consistent with your testimony here today?
A. It is essential to look at this statement as a whole document. And I think you get in trouble if you cherry pick one particular sentence out of context.
Q. And what do you mean by that, sir?
A. Well, the fact of the matter is, you know, six years of negotiations and innumerable model runs looking at how different variables might affect the flow regime, every one of those model runs and every one of our negotiation discussions was premised on built-in or baked-in assumptions on Georgia's water consumption, built-in assumptions on what portion of that consumption would be THE REPORTING GROUP
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returned downstream as effluent, and then using that 50-year period of record we built in some assumptions in terms of what reasonable expectations for the future would be. So with those variables locked in in terms of expectations on consumption and returns, we were able to sort of model different hydrographs.

As I explained earlier, Georgia had an allergic reaction to speaking publicly about putting any caps or limitations on consumption for political reasons; and we were sensitive to that. And that's why we were able to accommodate it and talk about it in terms of state line flows and expected returns. But the underlying numbers in the hydrograph were all premised on consumption caps, and all the negotiators knew that.
Q. And is there any doubt in your mind that Georgia knew that Florida would not accept just a minimum state line flow and that it also wanted some cap on consumption?
A. We were -- we were crystal clear every step of the way that what we were seeking was a water allocation, an equitable water apportionment. You cannot have an allocation without having THE REPORTING GROUP
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limitations. If you are not putting a limitation on water consumption, you're not allocating the resource. So by definition, every step of the way we were talking about limits on consumption, expectations for returns, and the effects that would have at the state line.
Q. Now, sir, Georgia's counsel asked you about the Southeastern Power case. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your understanding of what that case was about?
A. There are electric generating companies that would use the hydropower from the dams to create relatively low-cost power for local communities in Georgia. And as the Corps of Engineers was holding more water back for other purposes, they were not generating the same amount of hydropower, which meant they had to buy more expensive power from other sources to meet their customers' needs.

So this was a case where the Southeast Power organization was looking to have economic compensation for that lost hydropower. And that's the reason why Florida, while we were aware of the litigation, did not track it closely
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and did not seek to intervene because it was clear that the original intention of the litigation was to come up with an economic compensation for lost hydropower generation.
Q. And at some point did you learn that there was a settlement agreement reached in that case?
A. We learned that when one of the lawyers representing Georgia called Florida, and I would say somewhat sheepishly revealed what they had done.
Q. So you learned about this settlement agreement after it was reached?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you know prior to the settlement agreement being reached that Georgia was negotiating a water allocation agreement?
A. Absolutely not. We were stunned when we learned what had happened. There was -- it's hard to describe the level of surprise. We felt we were snookered.
Q. And why were you so surprised?
A. Well, because we had ongoing what we thought, and apparently were not, good faith negotiations with Georgia in what we thought, under a federal stay, court order stay, was the sole arena for THE REPORTING GROUP
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allocating those water resources. Our belief -and I think it was correct -- was that between the Compact, which had been adopted by three state legislatures and the U.S. Congress, and a federal court stay that directed the parties back to the Compact, that this was the place where these water resources would ultimately be allocated if we were successful. So to learn that the same people we were negotiating with within days would be in a mediation that we were not aware of to essentially allocate the same resource essentially transforming a case that was supposed to be about reimbursing a power customer into a water allocation agreement was -- was completely shocking.
Q. And, sir, at this point how long had the Compact negotiations been going on at the point that the settlement in the Southeast Power case was reached, which I believe counsel stated was in January of 2003?
A. Right. Well, the Compact negotiations at that point had been going on for four years, $I$ believe.
Q. And how frequently were you in touch with representatives of Georgia during the Compact THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


they would expect to see water flows in order to protect the interests for which they were responsible.
Q. And what do you mean by that? What do you mean by setting the baseline?
A. Well, I mean federal agencies obviously have statutory authority and they have got regulatory authority; but they also issue guidelines. And the guidelines are intended to instruct or inform parties in terms of what the agencies' expectations are. So those guidelines served as an important centering, if you will, for our ongoing negotiations.
Q. And, sir, if you look in the second paragraph of this document, do you see the last sentence there, we believe that the guidelines may serve purposes beyond an evaluation of allocation proposals because they represent a determination of flow regime features that are necessary for maintaining the present structure and function of the riverine ecosystems?
A. I see it, yes.
Q. And what is your understanding of that sentence in the context of this document?
A. Well, I mean, in plain English, it was the agency THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
responsible for water quality and for the other natural resources, Fish and Wildlife, saying from their perspective, from their expert perspective, these are the flows that we believe are necessary to preserve the functioning of the water quality and ecosystem in the Apalachicola River and Bay. And you take guidelines from federal agencies rather seriously. So if you're going to deviate from them, you better have a darned good reason.
Q. And, sir, I believe -- I know you weren't in the courtroom yesterday, but counsel made the statement that these guidelines were never adopted. Is that consistent with your understanding?
A. I'm not sure I understand what you mean by adopted. The -- I mean, agencies go through an administrative process to promulgate rules and regulations. But they also go through a process by which they issue guidelines. It's not quite as formal. It's not an administrative process per se. But both of these agencies in a number of contexts, not just this one, routinely issue guidelines. And the regulated community inevitably takes those guidelines very seriously because it's a road map to compliance or to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
staying, you know, on the right side of the federal interest.
Q. And, sir, were these guidelines final guidelines?
A. Well, that's -- that certainly is how they were presented to us; and that's certainly how they were treated by the parties at the negotiating table, yes.
Q. And if you look at the first paragraph of this letter, sir, it says, we are providing the enclosed final version of the instream flow guidelines. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And is that consistent with your understanding that these guidelines were final?
A. I don't believe they were ever changed through the life of the Compact. They were issued fairly early on in the Compact. We were all aware of them. We tried to stay true to them.
Q. Sir, Georgia's counsel asked you some questions at the end of his examination suggesting that Florida is to blame for the failure of the Compact negotiations. Is that your view?
A. No.
Q. And what is your view for why the Compact negotiations failed?
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A. I think at its very core the reason why the negotiations failed is because achieving a water allocation by definition requires dividing up a resource, which means putting limits on consumption of that resource. And in retrospect, looking at the history of the Compact, my belief is that Georgia never intended or had any interest in actually limiting its water consumption. And without a willingness to accept any limitations on water consumption, in the end you can never really allocate the resource. So while we did our level best to come up with different constructs to talk about it in different nomenclature and language to create a context that would create some hope that we could achieve it, $I$ think in the end the unwillingness to accept any kind of limitations on their water consumption was the ultimate undoing of the Compact.

And, you know, the Compact was always designed to expire. It was intended to last for a year. I think it lasted for nearly six. So I think, you know, it's an indication that the parties were doing their level best to try to negotiate something in the context of the THE REPORTING GROUP
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Compact; but in the end, the irreconcilable differences comes back to that basic sort of foundational point.
Q. Thank you, sir. You just reminded me that I wanted to refer you back to one additional document that counsel showed you at GX-1268. Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's the only example that counsel showed you of a reference to Georgia's good faith that postdates the Southeast Power settlement agreement. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And why -- I know this isn't your document; but why do you think there was a reference to good faith in this document?
A. I think the reality is that political leaders and governors are hopeful people, and they recognized that this was an historic opportunity to try to resolve an issue amicably and stay out of the federal courts. And they hoped against hope that we might find a pathway to do that. And I think in the spirit of keeping the conversation going and not poisoning the atmosphere with public statements otherwise, the political leadership, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
perhaps somewhat inaccurately, but I think for the best of intentions portrayed it as -- as an opportunity for some hope and optimism that we might still find a pathway to an amicable resolution and an allocation agreement.

As it turns out, of course, that was not possible.
Q. Thank you, sir.

MS. WINE: I have no further questions.
MR. PRIMIS: Just a few, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Mr. Struhs, first, on the EPA guidelines, I think your testimony was that they were guidelines. Correct?
A. That's what they're called, yes.
Q. And you distinguish them from regulations. Correct?
A. The point I was trying to make is that guidelines from federal agencies are serious documents that regulated parties or sub -- political subdivision states must take very seriously.
Q. You mentioned there's a regulatory process. Correct?

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart

That's what you just said before --
A. I did.
Q. -- that agencies go through. Correct?
A. The point I'm trying to make is that regulatory agencies, using their underlying statutory and regulatory authority, issue guidelines. And those guidelines have the effect of guiding behavior of the required parties. It's not an unusual circumstance for regulatory agencies to issue -- EPA does it routinely; and those guidelines are taken very seriously. And you -you ignore them at your own peril.
Q. You understand the difference between a guideline and a regulation. Right, sir?
A. I'm trying to explain that to you.
Q. Yes. And if you listen to my question, the EPA never issued regulations that encompassed these guidelines. True?
A. I'm not sure there is a regulatory means by which EPA or the Fish and Wildlife Service could have issued regulations specifically to this point, which is likely why they relied on their authority to issue guidelines.
Q. And the parties never agreed to these guidelines as part of the Compact. Right? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. Well, I wouldn't put it quite like that because, remember, the federal government through a federal commissioner was a party to the negotiations. There were four commissioners, including Mr. Thomas, who represented all the federal interests, all the federal agencies. So the federal agencies were part and parcel of the negotiations and of the Compact.
Q. Let me just get that straight. The federal government was part and parcel of the negotiations of the Compact; is that what you said, sir?
A. The federal commissioner -- so, again, if you read the Compact, it's clear that the federal commissioner would have to review any agreement that the States reached under the Compact. And in order to facilitate that -- and, again, the Compact -- I'm paraphrasing but, again, the Compact directs the federal agencies through the federal commissioner to support the efforts of the states to that effort. And I think the guidelines were these two federal agencies doing exactly what the Compact expected of them, which was to provide the guidelines to increase the chance of a successful resolution.
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Q. Now, back to Exhibit 1268, which is the press release from Governor Bush talking about good faith. Your counsel just pointed out that this was issued after Florida learned about the D.C. case settlement. True?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. And after that settlement was known to you, Governor Bush issued this statement talking about the good faith efforts of Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said, well, that's just politics. Hope springs eternal. Maybe we'll settle later. Right?
A. That's not quite how I characterized it, but I take your point.
Q. Okay. But you had concluded at this point it was bad faith; Georgia had acted in bad faith. Right?
A. From my point of view as the person who was leading the federal -- or, I'm sorry, the Florida negotiating team, they were operating in bad faith.

I think bad faith is one of those things where it's more apparent retrospectively than in THE REPORTING GROUP
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the heat of the moment, that it's not necessarily
just one instance; but it is a pattern of
behavior over, in this case, many years that led me to the conclusion that in fact Georgia was negotiating in bad faith, yes.
Q. And Florida's solution to that was to turn around and immediately sue the United States Army Corps of Engineers. True?

That was your next move in this case. Right?
A. I -- I believe that was filed after I left the State of Florida.
Q. Okay. So after you left Florida, notwithstanding all this bad faith by Georgia, Florida went and sued the Corps?
A. Yes.
Q. You said in your direct testimony and, again, on your redirect that you were upset because Mr. Reheis didn't give you maps. That bothered you. You just wanted to get the maps to show where that agricultural irrigation was going to be?
A. We wanted to see the basis for a 50 percent increase in the number of acres being irrigated, yes. And we thought that a visual representation of that would be helpful to see if it were true. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. Can you go back to FX-319, which is the Reheis letter.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, on page 4 of this document Mr. Reheis provides you with a chart. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. It's not a map, but it's a chart. It has all the counties in Georgia in the ACF Basin. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it shows who is drawing groundwater and who is drawing surface water by county. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And on those maps -- would you turn to page 10 of this memo.
A. Yes.
Q. And there are attachments referenced in Mr. Reheis's letter. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Florida didn't attach those maps when it produced this document, but you will agree with me that one of the items that Mr. Reheis attached was a map of the Chattahoochee and Flint River Basins showing all mapped and farmer-verified irrigated land. Correct?
A. Yes.
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MR. PRIMIS: No further questions.
MS. WINE: Just briefly, your Honor. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Sir, do you recall whether you ever reviewed those maps?
A. No, I never saw the maps. And I -- and I believe that footnote or the attachment note No. 2 -again, I have not seen the maps. I can't say.

But it appears as if it's talking about existing acres. It's talking about all the mapped and farmer-verified irrigated lands. And what Florida was seeking was a map of the additional acres that had not yet been put under irrigation permits.
Q. Thank you, sir.

MR. PRIMIS: Nothing further.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Struhs, are you familiar with the ACF Sustainable Water Management Plan?

THE WITNESS: No, I'm not. No, sir.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Why don't we THE REPORTING GROUP


|  | TRIAL - Novemb |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 380 |  | 382 |
| 1 | Protection Act. | 1 | declaration process. |
| 2 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 2 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 3 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip | 3 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip is |
| 4 | relates to the same memorandum, Florida | 4 | on the same general topic, but it's Florida |
| 5 | Exhibit 9. And the text that it addresses is | 5 | exhibit 88. In particular the number is |
| 6 | on the page here. | 6 | GA 375. |
| 7 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 7 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 8 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, what follows in | 8 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip |
| 9 | the next clip, likewise, relates to the same | 9 | relates to the same exhibit, later in the |
| 10 | memorandum that's at F -- Florida Exhibit 9. | 10 | same paragraph. It's Florida Exhibit 88. |
| 11 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 11 | And, again, the number is GA 375. |
| 12 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of | 12 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 13 | clips relate to which years are severe | 13 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next exhibit |
| 14 | drought years under the Flint River Drought | 14 | is a March 2012 press release. And it's |
| 15 | Protection Act. | 15 | Joint Exhibit 69. The testimony addresses |
| 16 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 16 | the first page in this clip, your Honor. |
| 17 | MR. PERRY: Same topic, your Honor. | 17 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 18 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 18 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of |
| 19 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip, | 19 | clips is a slightly different topic. It |
| 20 | likewise, addresses the same topic. | 20 | relates to a possible revision to the Flint |
| 21 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 21 | River Drought Protection Act and also to 2011 |
| 22 | MR. PERRY: This clip similarly | 22 | correspondence from the U.S. Fish and |
| 23 | addresses the same topic, your Honor. | 23 | Wildlife Service. The exhibits in particular |
| 24 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 24 | are Florida Exhibit 54 and Florida Exhibit |
| 25 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | 48. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 381 |  | 383 |
| 1 | clips relate to Florida Exhibit 78 and a | 1 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 2 | particular 2011 memorandum internally within | 2 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip |
| 3 | Georgia's Environmental Protection Division. | 3 | relates to Florida Exhibit 48, which is |
| 4 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 4 | another letter from the U.S. Fish and |
| 5 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of | 5 | Wildlife Service to Georgia Environmental |
| 6 | clips addresses Florida Exhibit 82. And that | 6 | Protection Division. |
| 7 | in particular is a September 2011 memorandum | 7 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 8 | from Mr. Zeng internally within the | 8 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip |
| 9 | Environmental Protection Division of Georgia. | 9 | continues on the same topic. |
| 10 | And here, your Honor, the first clip | 10 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 11 | relates very specifically to page GA 1614062. | 11 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip |
| 12 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 12 | similarly is on the same topic. |
| 13 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip | 13 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 14 | relates to the same document and the same | 14 | MR. PERRY: The next clip is more |
| 15 | paragraph, again, GA 1614062. | 15 | testimony on a similar topic. |
| 16 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 16 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 17 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next clip | 17 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of |
| 18 | relates to Florida Exhibit 82, and it's a | 18 | clips is on a different topic. The exhibits |
| 19 | different page. It's GA 1614063. | 19 | at issue in this next set of clips are Joint |
| 20 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 20 | Exhibit 154 and Florida Exhibit 59b. All of |
| 21 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of | 21 | these clips relate to a meeting where |
| 22 | clips relate to Florida Exhibit 89, Florida | 22 | Director Turner attended with other members |
| 23 | Exhibit 88, and Joint Exhibit 69. All of | 23 | of Georgia's Environmental Protection |
| 24 | them relate to the year 2012 and the Flint | 24 | Division and members of the Georgia |
| 25 | River Drought Protection Act drought | 25 | community. |
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| 388 |  |  | 390 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dr. Allan? |  | 1 | species of mussels are increasing, decreasing, or |
| 2 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. | 2 | stable. Correct? |
| 3 | MR. PRIMIS: Thank you. | 3 | A. Correct. |
| 4 | CROSS-EXAMINATION | 4 | MR. PRIMIS: And, Matt, you can leave |
| 5 | BY MR. PRIMIS: | 5 | that up. |
| 6 | Q. Good afternoon. Nice to see you again. | 6 | BY MR. PRIMIS: |
| 7 | These will be the exhibits that we use so | 7 | Q. And you don't know if there's been a decline in |
| 8 | that we can more efficiently go through them. | 8 | populations of the fat threeridge, the purple |
| 9 | A. Thank you. | 9 | bankclimber, or the Chipola slabshell since |
| 10 | MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I should just | 10 | they became listed as threatened or endangered. |
| 11 | say in advance that I promise the Court I do | 11 | True? |
| 12 | not intend to try this case by myself. I | 12 | A. So my studies did not track populations and did |
| 13 | think Florida scheduled the first few | 13 | not involve population studies. |
| 14 | witnesses to give me an endurance test | 14 | Q. Okay. So to answer my question specifically, you |
| 15 | because these are my folks. But soon enough, | 15 | don't know if there's been a decline in any of |
| 16 | other members of my team will be here. | 16 | the three endangered species since they became |
| 17 | BY MR. PRIMIS: | 17 | listed. Correct? |
| 18 | Q. Dr. Allan, good afternoon. | 18 | A. Correct. |
| 19 | A. Good afternoon. | 19 | Q. Okay. You base your mussel metric specifically |
| 20 | Q. Your direct testimony references four metrics | 20 | on the fat threeridge. Correct? |
| 21 | that you used to assess harm to species. | 21 | A. Correct. |
| 22 | Correct? | 22 | Q. Because you consider the fat threeridge as a |
| 23 | A. It does. | 23 | reasonable representative for the entire mussel |
| 24 | MR. PRIMIS: And if I could put it on | 24 | assemblage. Correct? |
| 25 | the screen, Mr. Smith. | 25 | A. Correct in part. I also rely on the fat |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
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| 389 |  |  | 391 |
| 1 | BY MR. PRIMIS: | 1 | threeridge because it's extensively studied, so |
| 2 | Q. You looked at metrics for mussels. Right? | 2 | there is an adequate data set for metric |
| 3 | A. Correct. | 3 | development. |
| 4 | Q. Floodplain fish? | 4 | Q. Okay. Dr. Allan, you don't have any idea how |
| 5 | A. Yes. | 5 | many fat threeridge mussels currently reside in |
| 6 | Q. Gulf sturgeon? | 6 | the Apalachicola River Basin; do you? |
| 7 | A. Yes. | 7 | A. Well, yes, $I$ do have an idea because $I$ have seen |
| 8 | Q. And the tupelo trees; correct? | 8 | estimates. I don't have -- $I$ don't have a high |
| 9 | A. Correct. | 9 | degree of confidence in those estimates; so I |
| 10 | Q. Okay. So I have just put them up there on the | 10 | can't tell you with any precision what I think |
| 11 | screen as a reminder for us. | 11 | the true number is. |
| 12 | I'm going to ask you a few initial questions | 12 | Q. Dr. Allan, you gave a deposition in this case. |
| 13 | about each of these, and then we'll come back and | 13 | Correct? |
| 14 | explore your methodology in more detail. Okay, | 14 | A. Yes, I did. |
| 15 | A. ${ }_{\text {Okay }}$ | 15 | Q. You were under oath when you gave that |
| 16 |  | 16 | deposition? |
| 17 | Q. Thank you. There are three mussels that are | 17 | A. Yes. |
| 18 | listed as threatened or endangered that live in | 18 | MR. PRIMIS: May I please have a copy of |
| 19 | A. Correct. | 19 | Dr. Allan's deposition. |
| 20 |  | 20 | May I approach, your Honor? |
| 21 | Q. That's the Chipola slabshell, the purple | 21 | BY MR. PRIMIS: |
| 22 | bankclimber, and the fat threeridge. Right? | 22 | Q. Dr. Allan, can I refer you to page 444, line 12 |
| 23 | A. Correct. | 23 | of your deposition. |
| 24 | Q. Now, you would agree with me that you didn't do | 24 | A. Yes. I'm looking for it. |
| 25 | any study to determine whether these three | 25 | Q. Okay. Dr. Allan, I'm going to play a video of |
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Q. The three species you looked at were the spotted sucker, the redear sunfish, and the large-mouthed bass. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You don't have data that would tell us what population levels of the spotted sucker are over any period of time. Correct?
A. I disagree with that characterization. The data that are presented in my report collected by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection is an annual census running some 14 or 15 years of recruitment into the population of newborn fish. That's classic fish population data.

And we see that that recruitment number is much higher in some years and much lower in other years, and that variation is statistically correlated with flow.
Q. Dr. Allan, could you refer to page 255, line 9 of your deposition.

MR. PRIMIS: And for the record, I'm going to play the video of 255 , lines 9 through 15.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. And I'm going to ask if you were asked those questions and gave those answers.
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(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Allan, were you asked those questions; and did you give those answers?
A. I gave those answers.

And the distinction is between the overall total population and the numbers, which is population of young fish. So I don't believe there is any inconsistency between my statement that we don't have a total population census, but we do have population data on recruitment to the population.
Q. Doctor, I asked a straightforward question. I said were you asked those questions, and did you give those answers under oath?
A. Yes.
Q. Dr. Allan, for the redear sunfish, you cannot tell me what the overall population numbers are for the redear sunfish over any period of time. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. With regard to the large-mouthed bass, you have no data that would tell us what the overall population has been over any period of time for the large-mouthed bass. True?
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## A. Correct.

Q. You say in your direct testimony that there are 142 freshwater and estuarine fish species in the Apalachicola River. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't have any population level data that would indicate whether any fish species in the Apalachicola River is increasing or decreasing. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You have no evidence that the fish populations in the Apalachicola River are currently not sustainable; correct?
A. I don't -- I don't believe I ever commented on whether those fish populations were sustainable or not sustainable; and so I don't really feel I can answer yes or no to that question.
Q. Can you turn to page 477, lines 15 through 22 of your deposition, sir.

MR. PRIMIS: And I would ask Mr. Smith to queue up the video for those pages, those lines.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Allan, were you asked that question; and did THE REPORTING GROUP


A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And, now, in your direct testimony, you only reported one of these fish metrics.
Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You used the bottom one for the fish in the small slough. And that's -- SWS stands for Swift Slough. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that's the one you chose and put in your report?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Let's focus for a bit on the ones that didn't make it into your report.

But before I do, I want to just talk about some of these columns and explain what Dr. Hornberger did.

In column 3, that's the recent 16 years column. Do you see that?

And that is the amount of harm, using your metrics, that Dr. Hornberger reported across each of those different types of fish in the river or fish in the slough. Right?
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## A. Correct.

Q. So this would tell me that for the recent 16 years for fish inundated for 60, the top row, that there were 13 different years that had harm and 1148 days in the recent 16 -year period. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that recent 16-year period is 1998 to 2013. Right?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. That's the period of study?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So your period that you looked to calculate harm in this case included all of the last 16 years from 2013 backward. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. So the year 2000, that's included in your harm metrics. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the year 2006, that would be included in your harm metrics. Right?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. Now -- and 2012 as well. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Dr. Hornberger, when he ran your metrics THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to see how many days of low flow there were, he used the Chattahoochee Gage. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that sits just beneath the Jim Woodruff Dam on the Apalachicola River. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you also have something on your chart called the remedy comparison?
A. I do.
Q. And those are the two columns on the right-hand side?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. The last column or the next to last column is called recent 16 years with remedy. Correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And so what you did there was you took the recent 16-year period as it existed at that gage in the real world, and you applied a remedy scenario to it to see did it change? Did we get any better in terms of low flow days for these species?
Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then the last column, decrease in harm, that is a comparison between recent 16 years and recent 16 years with remedy? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## A. Yes.

Q. So when you do all that and you look at the fish inundated for 60 days, the decrease in harm is zero in terms of years; and then the number in parentheses is the number of days fewer harm. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so for that particular fish metric, there were no fewer years; and there were 39 fewer days of harm. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that 39 days, that's over a 16 -year period. True?
A. True.
Q. And if we just take a straight average, we're talking about two days fewer harm per year. Right?
A. I would not subscribe to a straight average, but that's what the calculation comes out to.
Q. No matter which way you slice it, 39 days over 16 years is a small number. Right?
A. It's a small number.
Q. Now, in the next row, fish inundated for 120 , which I have highlighted on the ELMO and on the screen -- you can see it in your version, the THE REPORTING GROUP
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paper version, is a red number in the parentheses. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what that means is that for this metric, when you ran the remedy, there were actually seven more days of harm than if you just left the fish alone. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that was not what you expected to see. Right?
A. Actually, I'm not surprised by that result. And the reason I'm not surprised by that result is that the remedy is a relatively small number; and so when the flow magnitude at which harm occurs is large, the remedy is a small percentage. When the flow magnitude at which harm occurs is smaller, as it is in Swift Slough, then you see a dramatic improvement.

So it basically shows that the remedy will be most effective at the more -- at the low end of the flow, six, seven, 8,000 cfs; and the remedy doesn't do much at $\mathbf{1 2 , 0 0 0}, 14,000$ cfs.
Q. Dr. Allan, you have an asterisk next to your red seven, which represents more harm days. True?
A. I do.
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Q. And in your report, you put the asterisk as a footnote to say that the numbers in red font are in the opposite direction from expected. Isn't that what you wrote?
A. I wanted to be honest about it. Yes, they are.
Q. Okay. Now, for the fish in the large slough that -- is that the Kentucky Slough?
A. Kennedy.
Q. Kennedy Slough. Thank you.

That showed zero years in which there were -zero years that were taken out or not harmed and 102 days over the 16-year record of improvement. Right?
A. That's correct. That's the $\mathbf{1 2 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{c f s}$ threshold. And the remedy had statistically basically no impact whatsoever.
Q. And the same is true for the fish in Mary Slough, the small slough. Right?
A. Yes. Mary Slough has a higher harm threshold than Swift Slough. And that, again, explains the difference.
Q. Okay. So I think you said there was not statistically significant difference for the ones that have the very small change. Right?

Was that just your testimony a minute ago? THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. I would say that the change is very small. It's probably not biologically significant, $I$ think is a better phrasing.
Q. And the one that did have some -- showed some change that was biologically significant in your mind was the fish in the Swift Slough?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. We're going to come back to Swift Slough in a bit. But before we do that, I just want to ask you about this remedy scenario. You describe in your report a, quote, very conservative remedy scenario; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you say it's one, quote, in which Georgia reduces its water use relative to the present-day conditions, close quote. That's your testimony. Right?

Paragraph 73 if you need to refresh.
A. Sorry. Where -- if you want to ask me exact wording, I want to see where my exact wording is. Where is it, please?
Q. Your written direct testimony submitted in the
U.S. Supreme Court. It's paragraph 73.
A. I would like to ask you to repeat the question, please.
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Q. Yes. I'm just simply trying to level-set.

Your testimony is that this is a very
conservative remedy scenario in which Georgia reduces its water use relative to present-day conditions. Is that your testimony?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Okay. Your testimony does not say how much Georgia reduces its water use by in that -- in that document. Correct?
A. It does not. Correct.
Q. Now, in your expert report you didn't call it very conservative. Right?

That's new for trial?
A. I believe you're correct in that.
Q. And in the remedy -- in the expert report you called it, quote, 50 percent reduction scenario. Right?
A. I called it a --
Q. 50 percent reduction scenario.
A. I believe I did, yes.
Q. And that remedy scenario, that 50 percent reduction, it came from Dr. Flewelling's report. Right?
A. So I -- I can't confirm or deny that. I take my -- my values from Dr. Hornberger's report. If THE REPORTING GROUP
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he gets them from other people's reports, that's not my expert testimony. That's not my expertise.

I'm given a scenario by Dr. Hornberger, whose work I respect; and I take that scenario as being one that is, in his judgment, realistic and reasonable for the question asked. And that's where my role ends at that point because my role is to develop the metrics and not to evaluate the scenarios that Dr. Hornberger develops or gets from someone else.
Q. Okay. Just I want to make sure I understand. We know Dr. Hornberger ran your metrics?
A. Right.
Q. Through his model. Correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. As between Hornberger or Flewelling or some other expert, you don't know exactly where the very conservative remedy scenario came from. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, this very conservative remedy, it involves the elimination of 50 percent of all agricultural irrigation in Georgia every year. Correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. But there is more. Right? That's not all they THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## cut?

A. That's my understanding.
Q. In addition, the very conservative remedy scenario cuts 50 percent of all small impoundments in southwest Georgia. True?
A. We -- it cuts the evaporation from those impoundments. Correct.
Q. And in addition, the 50 percent very conservative remedy scenario eliminates all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin in Georgia. True?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, you don't know what it would take to cut 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in Georgia every year. Do you?
A. So you're asking me now to comment on the -- on the underpinnings of Dr. Hornberger's work; and that's outside my area of expertise.
Q. You applied a remedy scenario and are reporting to the Supreme Court of the United States. True?
A. I took the estimate of a highly, highly respected hydrologist who developed these scenarios. And he is open to your cross-examination, but it's not for me to comment on anything in terms of how he developed his analysis.
Q. Okay. Apart from whether you're going to comment THE REPORTING GROUP
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on not, Dr. Allan, I would like an answer to this question. Do you know what it would take to reduce agricultural water usage in Georgia by 50 percent?
A. If you're asking for a precise number, no; I do not know.
Q. And you have no opinion on whether a 50 percent reduction in agricultural water use is reasonable. Correct?
A. I'm here to comment on the impacts -- to report on the impacts of low flows on the ecological health of the Apalachicola River; and that's what I'm here to testify on.
Q. Okay. I just want an answer to this question so we have it clear for the record. You have no opinion on whether a 50 percent reduction in agricultural water use is reasonable. Correct?
A. I offer no expert opinion on that topic.
Q. Do you know if a 50 percent reduction in agricultural water use would put thousands of farmers in Georgia out of business?
A. I do not know.
Q. You consider that question completely irrelevant to your analysis. True?
A. I consider that question an important one to be THE REPORTING GROUP
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resolved in this case, but not for -- not to be resolved by me.
Q. At the time of your deposition, you didn't know whether the remedy scenario that you utilized involved reducing evaporation from small impoundments. Right?
A. At the time of my deposition, $I$ had -- I did not have clearly in my mind the details of the scenario when you asked me questions about it; that's correct.
Q. And at the time that you submitted your expert report and reported your results, you also didn't know if the remedy scenario included the elimination of interbasin transfers. Right?
A. Actually, I don't clearly remember one way or the other on that. Again, I was -- I have a high degree of confidence in Dr. Hornberger; and I took his scenario analysis and didn't try to dissect it.
Q. You don't know what it would take physically to eliminate all interbasin transfers out of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin; do you?
A. I do not have an expert opinion on that.
Q. And you don't have any idea how much that part of your remedy scenario would cost. True?
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A. I do not.
Q. And you don't know what it would do to the delivery of drinking water in the City of Atlanta if they were ordered to eliminate all interbasin transfers; do you?
A. I do not.
Q. You don't even know if it's possible to eliminate all interbasin transfers. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. In paragraph 73 of your testimony -- could you turn there if you're not there already.
A. Okay.
Q. And the line I want to draw your attention to says that using a less conservative remedy scenario that results in greater flows would provide an even greater positive impact on the riverine ecosystem. Isn't that right?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, in your work in this case, you never received, whether from Dr. Hornberger or Dr. Flewelling or anyone else, any remedy scenario other than the one that you present in your report. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And, in fact, you have never evaluated any other THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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remedy scenario that doesn't have a 50 percent cut in Georgia's agricultural irrigation every year. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so you're just speculating when you say in your testimony here that if you have more flow of water over a greater period of time, that means there's less harm under your model. Right?
A. I think it's a logical speculation, but I agree that it needs to be run through the metrics to be confirmed -- through the scenarios to be confirmed.
Q. Let me take that in pieces. You say it would be logical speculation?
A. I think that a less -- as I read this sentence, it appears to me to be inconsistent. And --
Q. Inconsistent with what, sir?
A. With itself.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm trying to remember and understand the exact idea here. So a less conservative remedy scenario -- so -- I apologize for what's overly complicated language.

So I think -- I'm trying to unpack this
myself. $I$ think the meaning of this sentence is THE REPORTING GROUP
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that a less conservative remedy scenario, meaning
a -- a remedy scenario that was, shall we say,
more demanding or stronger, would result in greater flows. And, yes, that would be expected to provide an even greater positive impact on the riverine ecosystem. But that should be confirmed by using -- actually, looking at the scenario combined with the metrics to -- to see what the numbers say.
Q. Dr. Allan, it's your testimony that it would be speculation to say that more flow would equal less harm; isn't it?
A. I think it's a -- I think it is, indeed, speculation, yes. I'Il agree with that.
Q. Now, let's go back to the floodplain fish, please, sir. Now, your -- can you turn to paragraph 47 of your testimony.
A. Paragraph 47.
Q. And this is where you say, reductions in connectivity reduce the size of fish year classes. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the year class means the total amount of young fish that are produced by adults spawning. Right?
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A. That's correct.
Q. And fish populations naturally have strong year classes and weak year classes. Right?
A. I say so in my report, yes.
Q. And occasional years of poor recruitment do not affect the viability of those populations. True?
A. That's true.
Q. Now, you say in your testimony in paragraph 47 that reductions in size of fish year classes in successive years due to low flows can seriously impair fish populations as a whole. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. Now, you don't have any evidence that reductions in size of fish year classes in successive years due to low flows has actually impaired in the real world any fish population in the Apalachicola River. Right?
A. So that's a general statement of fundamental fish biology, and it is not based on evidence of successive years in the Apalachicola. Right.
Q. When you did your study and found or projected low flow harm days, you didn't go back to see if there were large numbers of dead fish in the 13 years in which your study identified harm. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

A. That's correct.

> Q. And so if we go and look at your mussel metrics in 2000 , if it didn't hit 5700 cfs, you found harm. True?
A. So my report is very clear that harm occurs over a range, that harm occurs above a metric like 6,000 for the main channel margins and below that value. I point out, when I talk about the main channel metric for mussels where we use the $\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}$ value, that in the 2012 BiOp, they talk about some harm occurring at 10,000, some harm -greater harm occurred at 8,000. They talk about harm becoming more severe as you get down to 6,000, and obviously it continues below that.

There is no -- there's no possibility of that number being a simple switch where no harm occurs above it and all harm occurs below it because the environment and the habitat is more variable. Individuals are physiologically variable in their vulnerability to desiccation and low oxygen conditions.

So I just want to make very clear to the Court that a number like that is very useful for being able to work with Dr. Hornberger's metrics and ask, you know, what does harm look like over THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
a long period of record; but it is inconsistent, I believe, with the caution -- cautious language of my report to view that as an absolute threshold. No harm above, all harm below is simply a -- an evidence-based delineation where we -- you know, the photos that accompany this particular document on the previous page to what you referred to show what the slough looked like at 6000, 6400 cfs and what it looked like at 5300 cfs. So it's representing some range in which harm becomes apparent.
Q. Dr. Allan, again, I would ask you to please slow down for the court reporter.

And also, if you can, just please try and listen to my question and focus on what I'm asking. Okay?

Now, in your metric for Swift Slough that you gave to Dr. Hornberger, you told him to run it at 5700 cfs for 30 days in the summer. True?
A. True.
Q. And so in the year 2000, when he ran that, he ran it against 5700 cfs for 30 days in the summer. Correct?
A. I assume that's what he did, yes.
Q. You didn't -- you don't know?
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That's what he did. Right?
A. I didn't ask him what did you do in 2000? What did you do in 2001? What did you do in 2002?

I'm quite confident that that's what he did.
Q. But you --
A. But $I$ can't testify that $I$ asked him that question.
Q. And in 2006 when he checked, he ran 5700. Correct?
A. He would have run 5700.
Q. And when he ran in 2012, he would have run 5700. Right?
A. Again.
Q. And so in 2000, if the connection rate was substantially below 5700, you would show days -he would show days of harm under your analysis that really shouldn't have been counted as harm. True?
A. Would you repeat that question, please.
Q. I'm going to come back to that.

Now, if Swift Slough becomes disconnected from the main channel and there was a mortality event there, that doesn't say what happens in all the other sloughs throughout the area. Correct?
A. Not entirely correct, no. It's probably a good THE REPORTING GROUP
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indication of what happened in other sloughs that have a disconnect in the 5,000 to 6,000 range.
Q. Dr. Allan, do you have your transcript with you?

Do you have your deposition transcript?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you refer to page 419, line 20, through page 420, line 2. Do you have that?
A. 419.
Q. 419,20 .
A. Where are we again, please?
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Allan, were you asked that question; and did
you give that answer?
A. I did.
Q. Now, if you had a die-off in Swift Slough, that doesn't necessarily tell you anything about the long-term viability of the population of the species as a whole in the River Basin. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's because your metrics were not designed to estimate population size and mortality.
Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, I asked you this question about the fish; THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart






## Right?

```
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you turn to page 18 .
A. I'm there.
Q. On page 18 Dr. Kondolf has a section of this paper called Cutting Off and Filling Sloughs. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. In the middle of the first paragraph he has a statement that says, to discourage flow in the sloughs, the Corps actively pumped dredged sand into some sloughs. In other cases, dredged sand was placed just upstream of the inlets of sloughs, such that the sand was carried into the sloughs by inflowing water.
Do you see that?
```

A. I see that.
Q. And I think you testified earlier that you're aware that that is what happened in Swift Slough. Correct -- the second one?
A. I have some general understanding of -- that there had been sediments that were either deposited by Army Corps activities or mobilized by Army Corps activities that may have impacted the entrance to Swift Slough. But I would not THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
have been in a position to make a definitive statement about the effect of it.
Q. If Kondolf says it, you would trust it. Right?
A. If Kondolf said it in his expert report for this trial, I would definitely trust it.
Q. Do you know whether Dr. Kondolf commented on the reason that Swift Slough connection elevations went up in his direct testimony in this case?
A. I don't recall whether he commented on that.
Q. Have you read his direct testimony?
A. I have.
Q. And so if it's in there, you would -- you would credit it. Right?
A. Maybe not.
Q. Let's go down to the next paragraph, Dr. Allan.
A. Okay.
Q. In the third line down Dr. Kondolf writes, the sand plugs would prevent or at least inhibit flow into these sloughs, even when water levels in the main river would otherwise be high enough to drive flow into the sloughs.

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And you have no reason to dispute that statement by Dr. Kondolf. Right?
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A. I am wondering if -- since the sentence above refers to vegetated sand plugs, whether the next sentence, even though it doesn't say vegetated, it has that same reference because it's hugely important whether vegetation invades these sand plugs and stabilizes it as to whether they will stay in place. Without that vegetation, they're very probably going to be displaced in the next high flow event.

So in general sand plugs, particularly if they become vegetated, can have that effect. I see that.
Q. The next sentence says that the sand in these plugs likely had its origins in the Corps navigational dredging program, which mobilized sand into suspension and resulted in its wide distribution.

> Do you see that?
A. I see that. It's possible.
Q. And you know that happened in the Apalachicola River near Swift Slough. Right?
A. I don't feel I -- I can't agree that I know that.
Q. Okay. And you didn't take the information in this paragraph into account in setting your flow metric for Swift Slough. Right?
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A. I did not.
Q. Can you turn to page 4 of this.
A. Page 4?
Q. Yes. And I want to refer your attention to paragraph B.
A. I see it.
Q. The paragraph B is called Manually Remove Sediment Plugs From Outflowing Sloughs. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And Dr. Kondolf reports here that restoration on the Apalachicola River should prioritize the removal of sediment plugs that cut off flow into sloughs that convey water away from the mainstem river.

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And he says, manual removal of these small sediment plugs would minimize adverse impacts. Correct?
A. I see that.
Q. And you have no information one way or the other whether Florida ever did that in Swift Slough. Correct?
A. I don't recall.
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Q. Can you go to page 42.
A. }42
Q. And I'm looking now at the third paragraph down.
A. I see it. I see it.
Q. And this is where Dr. Kondolf says, among the
sloughs for which such low impact plug removal
could potentially yield significant benefits in
rewatering the slough network are the spider cuts on the Chipola River, Swift Slough, Douglas Slough, Piney Slough, and Shepard's Lake Slough. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And you have no basis to disagree with Dr. Kondolf when he wrote in 2009 that Swift Slough was a good candidate for low impact plug removal. Right?
```

A. Well, I would want to ask Dr. Kondolf, who is the expert and wrote this, to testify on this document, not ask me to testify on it.

But I see, you know, could potentially yield significant benefits. Here is a list.

I see a document that -- by a person $I$ certainly respect, but which has no survey data in it, no quantitative information in it, where it appears that he has looked carefully at the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
system and with his expert judgment said here are some things that could help.

And I trust his expert judgment is well worth following up. But that's quite different from saying here is hard evidence that we got to get a sand plug out of Swift Slough to make a difference.
Q. And everything you just said, you didn't consider any of that in issuing your expert opinions in this case about Swift Slough. True?
A. True.
Q. Now, you visited the Apalachicola River on two occasions. Right?
A. Two occasions where I was with Florida DEP; and I did a personal road trip where $I$ drove along the -- the Apalachicola Highway.
Q. On the road trip, you testified you hadn't seen too much because you were on the road?
A. I saw what the landscape looked like around it; but, yeah, I didn't go to the river.
Q. Okay.
A. I got to the bay instead.
Q. Let's focus on when you actually went to the river.
A. Okay.
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Q. You went with Ted Hoehn, who testified yesterday and earlier today. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Helen Light went out with you on the river. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And we talked yesterday about an environmental consulting group called EnviroScience. And you know Greg Zimmerman from that outfit?
A. I do.
Q. And he helped you work on this case, too. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in the course of your work, you visited Swift Slough? You were there?
A. I was there.
Q. And in all your discussions with Mr. Hoehn and Ms. Light while you were there, nobody mentioned to you that sediment had aggraded in the inlet to Swift Slough and increased the connection level by 25 percent between 2000 and 2006. Right?
A. Again, I -- I can't say with confidence recalling conversations that would have taken place in -sometime in the spring of 2012.

I did hear discussion about possible sediment accumulation in -- near the mouth of Swift THE REPORTING GROUP
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Slough. I did not take away from that the impression that it was a -- an important factor causing change. And that was my very first introduction to the system, and I was still learning about it.

So put all that together, I can't give you a strong yes or no answer to what I knew at that time.
Q. Okay. And whatever they told you, you chose one metric for the entire 16-year period of Swift Slough, 5700 cfs. Right?
A. So I actually considered metrics above and below that based on some of the photographic evidence that's in my testimony -- my prefiled testimony and in my report. And in the discussion with Ted Hoehn and Helen Light, realizing that picking a hard number is open to the kind of criticism that I'm receiving right now, we could have picked 6100. We could have picked 5700. We could have picked 5300. But 5700 corresponds to a published number in the Helen Light document for the sill height. And in my personal judgment, I selected that number as a reasonable intermediate value for Dr. Hornberger to tell us what would happen if the flows were lower or the flows were THE REPORTING GROUP
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under the scenario where Georgia's consumption is less.

And this is a model. And you're essentially looking at one point on the graph and asking whether I'm making a claim about that one point on the graph. And I'm making a claim based on the totality of the data.
Q. Dr. Allan, I'm not trying to be difficult.

Mr. Hoehn submitted in the United States Supreme Court this picture of dead mussels in Swift Slough in 2006. You're the expert on this issue. Is it your contention that Georgia killed those mussels that are in the picture on the screen from Mr. Hoehn's testimony?
A. It is my contention that Georgia's consumption makes it more likely that such mortality events will occur as a result of Georgia's consumption than in the absence of Georgia's consumption. So it is a probabilistic statement that under low flow conditions of low flow years which include natural variability in their onset, the additional impact of Georgia's consumption make mortality events such as this more probable.
Q. Dr. Allan, can you answer this question yes or no. Do you contend that Georgia killed the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
mussels pictured in Mr. Hoehn's picture?
A. I don't think it's a yes or no answer. I think I gave you my answer.
Q. Thank you.

Now, you -- when you visited the -- the river in 2012, it was springtime. Correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. And you saw adequate water in the river at that time. Right?
A. We walked -- I don't have a clear recollection of exactly what conditions were like. I do know that we were -- we entered some of the sloughs -some of the smaller sloughs. I remember that we couldn't take a boat into them because there was too little water. So we got out of the boats and we walked. So it would have been a low water period from the standpoint of at least some of the sloughs. That's my best recollection.
Q. It was May 2012 when you went?
A. I think that's right, yes.
Q. And it was a drought, correct, in May of 2012?
A. It was a relatively low flow period. It was my first visit to the river; and I did not have any historical background on when -- on hydrology at that time from others to help me know anything THE REPORTING GROUP
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other than it was a period when we could get on the water in a boat on the river, but for most of the smaller sloughs, we couldn't enter them.
Q. Dr. Allan, just to -- please focus on my question. Was there adequate water in the river in May of 2012 when you visited the river with Mr. Hoehn?
A. Please tell me; adequate in what sense?

MR. PRIMIS: Mr. Smith, can you queue it up?
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. We're on page 190 -- can you refer to page 197, line 6 of your deposition?
A. 197, line 6 of deposition.

197, line 6.
Q. Yes. We'll play it on the video.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Allan, were you asked those questions; and did you give those answers?
A. I did. I think they're about the same answers I just gave you. My memory is about the same on that.
Q. Now, when you visited, you said you went to Swift Slough and some other sloughs. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Correct.
Q. And at that time the water was not at an extreme low. Right?
A. I can't answer.
Q. Would it refresh your recollection to look at page 225 of your deposition, line 16 ?
A. I see that.
Q. And does that refresh your recollection that flows were not in an extreme low condition when you visited there in May of 2012?
A. It refreshes $m y$ recollection that $I$ was vague on what flows were like when I visited when you asked me these questions in my deposition, and my answers are no better right now.
Q. Dr. Allan, when you visited, you saw situations where you thought that further decreases in water could cause harm. Correct?
A. I think so.
Q. But on that trip, you didn't visually see harm yourself. Correct?
A. So on that trip, I saw locations along the stream bank margins, the riverbank margins, where there were mussels that were in low -- topographically low locations next to the river where any further drop in river level would likely leave them THE REPORTING GROUP
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stranded. I walked into sloughs where there was some water present and further drops in water could leave them stranded.

But, again, I was forming my first impressions of the river. And it's four years ago, and I do not have clear memory of exactly what I saw then.
Q. Dr. Allan, I'm going to play a passage from your deposition; and I'm going to ask if you were asked those questions and gave those answers.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Allan, were you asked those questions; and did you give those answers?
A. I did.
Q. Now, can you turn to tab 11 of the book I have given you. And for the record, this is GX-407.

Dr. Allan, you have seen this chart before. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. This is a hydrograph of the month when you were visiting the river with Ted Hoehn. Correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. And at no point on this hydrograph does the daily flow go above 5800 cfs. Correct?
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A. That's correct.
Q. And almost every day is below 5700 cfs. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And flows below 5700 cfs trigger one of the harm metrics for mussels. True?
A. That is correct.
Q. Now, I would like to go back again -- well, you found harm to the mussels in Swift Slough in 2011 and 2012 under your analysis. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's the same time period that you were visiting the river. Correct?
A. Well, I think my visit was earlier than the harm window. And I think we're establishing that the first time I went to the river and well before -you know, three years before we had these kinds of analyses. I really have an imperfect recollection of what the conditions were and what I was observing.
Q. Now, Dr. Allan, over the period of time that you have been working on the case --
A. Yes.
Q. -- four years, you never went out to the river to see if there were actually mussels being harmed when your metrics predicted harm. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. That's correct.
Q. And you didn't go out and look to see if there were actually mussels being harmed in any year for which you show harm. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, focusing on the endangered mussels for a moment, your harm metrics for mussels does not address the Chipola slabshell specifically. Right?
A. It does not.
Q. And that mussel is not vulnerable to water level changes. True?
A. Generally considered less vulnerable, yes.
Q. And that's a finding of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, too?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And, in fact, you're not claiming that Georgia did anything to harm that Chipola slabshell. Right?
A. No. I'm not.
Q. Now, the other endangered one, other than the fat threeridge, is the purple bankclimber. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the purple bankclimber lives up around the Woodruff Dam. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## A. Correct.

Q. Your report does not present or does not claim that Georgia caused harm upstream of mile 80, which is the final 20 miles up near the dam. Correct?
A. Say that again, please.
Q. Your harm does not -- your report, your testimony, does not present evidence of harm upstream of mile 80. Correct?
A. My report does not present any metrics to say there is harm upstream of the mile 80.
Q. And that's the area beneath Jim Woodruff Dam?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the reason you didn't attribute harm there was that it was simply too difficult to separate out channel erosion issues from flow issues in that stretch of the river. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And because that's where the purple bankclimber lives, your analysis does not pursue the issue of harm to the purple bankclimber. Right?
A. So my analysis does in general talk about harm to the mussel assemblage; but it does not do a species by species evaluation of harm, including for the purple bankclimber.
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A. I claim that they were harmed during episodes of low flow, and that we can use Dr. Hornberger's scenarios to approximate how the frequency of those harmful events have changed under different scenarios.
Q. Dr. Allan, can you go to page 124 of the BiOp.
A. I'm there.
Q. And we covered this with Mr. Hoehn, but I think it pertains to your analysis as well. Do you see midway down the second paragraph it states that based on these densities and the area of habitat mapped in each river reach, current estimates of the population size of fat threeridge range from 6 million to 18.6 million individuals with a mean of approximately $12,167,000$.

Do you see that?
A. I do; but I would like to look at it for just a moment longer, please.
Q. Sure.
A. I -- thank you for letting me refresh my memory on this. Please continue.
Q. And you understand these are the estimates of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service as of a month ago for fat threeridge population. Correct?
A. Actually, I understand that these are estimates THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
from -- from the studies of Smit and Kaeser that
the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has adopted.
That's my understanding.
Q. I'll rephrase my question. Do you understand that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has adopted these estimates of millions and millions of fat threeridge mussels?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, the next sentence talks about what's called a take. You know what take is, right?
A. Generally, yes.
Q. And take in this context means a dead mussel caused by flow conditions. Right?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, the biological opinion has a take estimate of 8,374 fat threeridge. Do you see that, the next sentence, page 124?
A. Yes. Thank you.

I see it.
Q. And that is over the period of time in which the Army Corps has been operating under the Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And you understand that that calls for $5,000 \mathrm{cfs}$ in low flow conditions --
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A. Yeah.
Q. -- and drought conditions. Right?
A. Yeah.
Q. And Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that over that period of time that the Army Corps has been operating under the RIOP, that the total take of the fat threeridge population is .07 percent of the population. Do you see that?
A. I see that number; I don't know if I agree with it.
Q. But you do understand that that's what the Fish and Wildlife Service reported weeks before this trial began. Right?
A. When I look at this report, I see that a scientific study collected 4,000 mussels and predicted that there were 12 million, that the number of mussels they collected to generate that number is actually smaller than the number that is considered to be an allowable take. So the degree of extrapolation, the methodological issues leaves me, like I think Mr. Hoehn, with considerable uneasiness about taking these numbers verbatim.
Q. Oh, Mr. Hoehn disagreed with it explicitly. Do you understand that?
A. I understand that, yes.
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Q. And you have doubts about them. Right?
A. I have strong doubts about both the survey methodology, the extrapolation, and the subsequent sampling that did not fully corroborate the original estimates on what -the original samples that went into the estimate.

So there's just a lot of -- a lot of interesting information here that really calls out for more study but does not, in my view, call out for a conclusion.
Q. Dr. Allan, it would be a good thing if there's more mussels. You would agree with that?
A. It would be a good thing if there were more mussels.
Q. Thank you. Now, you know that the Army Corps is currently updating its Water Control Manual. Right? Do you understand that?
A. I understand that.
Q. And you understand that the Fish and Wildlife Service evaluated the impacts of the new Water Control Manual on endangered species. Correct?
A. It's my understanding that's the purpose of this document is to evaluate the change in water control operating procedures for threatened and listed species.
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Q. That's exactly what the Service is doing here in this document. Correct?
A. Yes. And it's not what I'm doing.
Q. And you understand that the Service approved the new Water Control Manual. Correct?
A. Actually, I -- I'm not sure I was aware of that.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, might this be a good breaking time for the day; or do you want to go to the distance?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It's up to counsel.

MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, I know Dr. Allan is suffering from a head cold; so I think a break now would be fine.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's fine. You remember that tomorrow is Bankruptcy
Court. We will -- unless you want to sit in in the Bankruptcy Court, we will resume on Thursday at 9 o'clock.

MR. QURESHI: Understood.
MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.
(Time Noted: 4:11 p.m.)
(Proceeding adjourned to Thursday, November 3, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.)
(End of day)
THE REPORTING GROUP
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