


```
    causes of harm.
Q. Your metrics don't identify any harms that you
        would say were not primarily caused by Georgia's
        water consumption. Correct?
    A. The nature of the question is -- is -- is
        difficult to answer because it's not -- it
        doesn't address what my report -- what my
        analysis did. So it's just -- to me it's just a
        confusing question. I'm not sure what you're
        asking me.
    Q. Can I refer you to page 44, line 24 of your
    deposition, sir.
A. Page 44--
Q. 44, line 24.
    MR. PRIMIS: And I ask Mr. Smith to
    queue clip 36.
        (Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, when it comes to harms that were caused by multiple factors, Dr. Allan, your report does not make any estimate of Georgia's relative contribution. Correct?
THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. My report asks the straightforward question, is there evidence that harm can be attributed to Georgia's consumption, to which the answer is yes. I did not attempt to ask and answer that question for other causes of harm.
Q. Dr. Allan, my question is when it comes to harm caused by multiple factors, your report did not make any estimate of Georgia's relative contribution. True?
A. I think my answer is that -- is an accurate answer. So I did not -- indeed, I did not attempt to partition out and, therefore, have a relative number for the impact of Georgia's consumption versus another cause versus another cause. I simply established that there was a causal relationship between -- using Hornberger's analysis between Georgia's consumption and changes to the ecology of the system.
Q. Dr. Allan, for harms caused by multiple factors, your report does not estimate the relative contribution of any causal factor. True?
A. Because \(I\) focused on one factor it is not a relative analysis. It is analysis focused on a single factor.
Q. And that factor is Georgia. True? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. Yes.
Q. Let's focus now on the role of the Army Corps, Dr. Allan. It's true, isn't it, that you did no analysis to determine whether the Corps' dam and reservoir operations have any effect on river floodplain inundation in the Apalachicola River?
A. That's correct.
Q. You do not know if the dams on the Chattahoochee caused loss of natural flow variability. True?
A. Correct.
Q. You don't know if the dams on the Chattahoochee impact the natural flow variability of water that reaches Lake Seminole. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you did not study the role of the Army Corps of Engineers in controlling the flow of water in the ACF Basin at all. Correct?
A. It was not my brief to do the hydrologic analysis. These questions should be directed to the hydrologist on the case and not to me.
Q. Is the answer to the question no?
A. The answer to the question is correct.
Q. I'm sorry. That's not clear. Is the answer to my question no?
A. No, I did not do any hydrologic analysis of the THE REPORTING GROUP
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Army Corps operations.
Q. You didn't do anything to rule out Corps dam and reservoir operations as a potential cause for the reduction in flows in the Apalachicola River. Correct?
A. That would be the analysis of the hydrologist on the case and not mine. So, correct.
Q. In fact, there was no effort on your part to specifically understand how the Corps dam operations would influence inundation of the river. True?
A. That would be the work of the hydrologist on the case. True.
Q. Are you saying the answer to my question is true?
A. I did not do the hydrologic analysis. Another expert did the hydrologic analysis.
Q. That's not quite my question. I don't mean to quibble, but I would like a clear answer to this question.
A. The whole string of questions you're asking me is if I did a hydrologic analysis on the dams and the Army Corps, and the answer to all of those is, no; that was not part of my brief.
Q. I'm going to try one last time, and then I'll move on. Dr. Allan, did you make any effort to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


of Dr. Hornberger's report that bore on my metric analyses.
Q. Dr. Allan, can I refer you to page 27 of your deposition and ask Mr. Smith to queue up clip 16.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Were you asked those questions; and did you give those answers, Dr. Allan?
A. I did.
Q. At the very beginning of this case when Dr. Hornberger came in, you introduced yourselves to one another. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And as of your deposition, that was the only conversation you had ever had with Dr. Hornberger. Correct?
A. No, I don't believe that's correct. And I believe that in my deposition I indicated that my memory was not entirely clear on my previous conversations with Dr. Hornberger; but I indicated that there might have been a second conversation. And in addition, \(I\) had conversations with some of doctor -- that \(I\) believe were some of Dr. Hornberger's associates. So there was a fair amount of sharing information THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
back and forth.
And at the time of \(\mathbf{m y}\) deposition \(I\) remember
clearly the initial conversation and indicated that my memory was not clear on the nature of subsequent conversations; but certainly we -- you know, I have had to clarify for Dr. Hornberger's team exactly what my metrics were so that he could use them in his scenario analyses.
Q. Your testimony is that you spoke with members of Dr. Hornberger's team prior to filing your expert report?
A. Prior to?
Q. Filing your expert report.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you refer to page 29, line 4 of your deposition.

MR. PRIMIS: And I'll ask Mr. Smith to queue up clip 17.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Were you asked those questions, and did you give those answers?
A. I gave those answers at that time. That's correct.
Q. Now, Dr. Allan, you never discussed
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Dr. Hornberger's report with him before submitting your expert report in this case. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You never reviewed Dr. Hornberger's code that he used to run his model. Right?
A. I did not.
Q. And you never ran any of his models yourself. Right?
A. I did not.
Q. You never talked with Dr. Hornberger about his model. True?
A. There were discussions -- phone conversations in which hydrologists were on the phone; I was on the phone. We were describing some of our work-in-progress. And lawyers were present.

I can't say with perfect memory, but -- but in general to your questioning, \(I\) relied on Dr. Hornberger's report. I did not discuss it with him. I took it as an expert opinion on the hydrology, and my work relies entirely on Dr. Hornberger for the scenarios in the causation analysis.
Q. Okay. Now, back to my question. You never talked to Dr. Hornberger about his model -THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

\section*{A. Correct.}
Q. -- correct?

And you don't make any provision in your analysis for the proposition that Dr. Hornberger might be wrong. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let's shift gears now, Dr. Allan. In your direct testimony, you claim multiple times that without a remedy, the ecosystem in the Apalachicola River Basin will suffer irreversible harm. True?
A. Something like that, so I'll say true for now. If you point me to the exact sentence, it would be helpful.
Q. Did you say in paragraph 2 of your testimony that without a remedy in the near term, it is highly likely that the system will face fundamental long-term and potentially irreversible damage?
A. So thank you for reading the exact sentence because I -- you phrased the question to me as a declarative, will suffer irreparable harm. And I think in all my writings I'm cautious to say is likely to, may, is a concern. And so I do not -unless you can point me to a sentence where I say definitively will cause irreparable harm, then, THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. I don't have a history of warnings on that topic,
so I can't say one way or the other.
Q. You're not aware of that?
You're not aware that in 2007, the Secretary
of the Florida Department of Environmental
Protection wrote a letter to the Army Corps in
which he predicted irreparable harm to Gulf
sturgeon and mussel species?

```
A. So I am aware that there's been a long history of
    dispute on water between Florida and upstream
    activities. And I have seen some documents of
    earlier statements from Florida, but \(I\) can't tell
    you from memory whether \(I\) have seen that specific
    one.
Q. Can you turn to tab 14 of your binder.
A. Tab 14.
    MR. PRIMIS: And I will advise the Court
    that this is the last examination we're going
    to do where the documents are not all
    premarked with GX numbers for tracking. We
    are working with the staff to facilitate
    that, but we didn't want to change Dr. Allan's
    binder while he had it.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. So, Dr. Allan, do you see that this is a
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November 8, 2007, letter from Mike Sole to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps?
A. I see that.
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Can you turn to the second paragraph. And in particular, let's just start, just to set the table, in the second paragraph it says that the State of Florida opposes the Corps' proposed exceptional drought operations.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And do you know what the exceptional drought operations of the Corps are?
A. No. As I have already testified, I have not studied the Corps' activities.
Q. And in the next sentence Mr. Sole wrote, if implemented, the exceptional drought operations would starve the Apalachicola River and Bay of freshwater flows needed to keep the ecosystems, species, and economy alive.

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And he wrote that nine years ago. Correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. So let's go to the very bottom of that page, and it carries over. There Mr. Sole writes, the Corps' modeling shows the exceptional drought operations would be in place through 2010. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Effectively capping Apalachicola River flow between 4150 to \(5,000 \mathrm{cfs}\) during that period and allowing the Corps to store all basin inflow above that cap.

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And I take it you don't have enough background in Corps operations to understand that that means that in a drought, the Corps would store water in reservoirs to maintain a 5,000 cfs flow at the state line. Correct?
A. I think I understand that.
Q. Okay. And then in the next sentence Mr. Sole writes, thus exceptional drought operations would result in unprecedented declines in river levels and cause irreparable harm to Gulf sturgeon and federally protected mussel populations.

\section*{Do you see that?}
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A. I see that.
Q. And do you disagree that Florida took that position nine years ago in 2007?
A. I -- I really, truly have no expert opinion on this. I have not seen this. I don't believe I have seen this letter previously. I have not studied Army Corps operations. I have not been part of the discussions that took place nine years ago focused on Army Corps operations. So I certainly can't offer an operation on this.
Q. Okay. And, Dr. Allan, you can offer an opinion though that the Gulf sturgeon and the federally protected mussel populations have not been irreparably harmed in the last nine years. Correct?
A. Well, the Gulf sturgeon and the mussels continue to survive; so if the meaning of irreparable in this letter -- if we could substitute the language would cause to go extinct, then I would agree that it has not caused them to go extinct. But since the language is would cause irreparable harm, I honestly don't know whether those populations have been harmed during that time period by those operations or not.

I know the populations are still surviving. THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. Dr. Allan, I would like to shift gears now, again, and turn to the calculations that you did for a decrease in harm under the conservative remedy you chose. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. And what we have done to facilitate and streamline this is we took all of your remedy figures and condensed them onto one slide so they're on one place, and we can see them all at the same time. And I'm going to show that to you and ask you to confirm that those, in fact, are the columns called Decrease in Harm. Okay?
A. Okay.
MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, we can put it
on the screen; but I also made a
demonstrative that may be easier to flip through.
May I approach?
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Allan, the first page is simply just a collection of the 15 metrics that you did for decrease in harm. Do you recognize those from your expert report?
THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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A. They look the same. I haven't compared them exactly, but they look the same.
Q. And then the second page we have highlighted some, and I'll come to that in a minute.
Just to level-set and put us all on the same page here, as we put in the header of this demonstrative -- and we'll call it Allan demonstrative 1 -- your remedy scenario involves a 50 percent cut in Georgia's agricultural irrigation every year, a 50 percent reduction in evaporation from small impoundments, and 100 percent elimination of interbasin transfers. Correct?

```
A. That is scenario 3, as \(I\) understand it, from the Hornberger report. Those are Dr. Hornberger's scenarios, and they are the ones that were used with my metrics to evaluate the remedy benefits to the ecosystem. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, the way your chart works is that in the column where you have decrease in harm, the first number represents a change in the number of years in which harm occurred. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And the second number in parentheses is a reduction in the number of days in which harm THE REPORTING GROUP
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occurred under your metrics. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And all of these are over a 16 -year period.

Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, Dr. Allan, I just want to do some simple math with you now. And I have the calculator, so I'm going to hand you this calculator and ask you to just establish one number for me. Okay?

Would you trust me to do it, or would you like to punch the numbers yourself?
A. Please go ahead, Mr. Primis.
Q. Thank you. So 16 years at 365 days a year -I'll leave out the leap years, although now that I think of it, I probably should include them.

16 times 365 is about 5,840 days. Correct?
A. That's what the math says, yes.
Q. Okay. And what I would like to do is just set a benchmark of 2-1/2 percent of that 16-year period. So I'm going to multiply --
A. Excuse me, Mr. Primis.
Q. Yes?
A. I object to that calculation because all of these metrics have a timing window. And those timing THE REPORTING GROUP
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windows are not 365 days. They might be 60 days or they might be \(\mathbf{9 0}\) days, and they differ with the metric.

So it's not the number of days out of 365 . It's the number of days out of the window during which flows are low and harm may occur. So I don't think it's a valid calculation.
Q. Okay. But I'm entitled to ask you the questions, and you can explain all that when Mr. Qureshi is up here. I'm sure he will.

But for present purposes, if we look at 2-1/2 percent, I multiply by .025 . Correct; that's 2-1/2 percent?

And I get 146 days is \(2-1 / 2\) percent. Would you agree with that math?
A. I agree with the math, but not the logic.
Q. Okay. Now, on the second page of our chart, Allan demonstrative 1, I have highlighted all of the ones that are fewer than 146 days and change over 16 years. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And for the fish metrics, four of them are less than 2-1/2 percent of the 16-year time period. Correct?

Yes?
THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Q. In this case, you haven't studied any bird
species. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you don't have evidence of any change in the
bird populations caused by Georgia's water use in
Apalachicola. True?
A. That's true.
Q. You haven't studied any amphibian species in this
case. Right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you have no information of any change in
amphibian populations caused by Georgia's water
use. True?
A. True.
Q. You haven't studied any reptile species. True?
A. True.
Q. And you have no evidence of any change in reptile
species caused by Georgia's water use. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you haven't studied any mammal species.
True?
A. True.
Q. And you have no evidence of any change over any
period of time to any of the mammal species in
the Apalachicola region. Correct?
THE REPORTING GROUP
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    A. That's correct.
    Q. Okay. Dr. Allan, I want to turn now to tab 16 of
        the binder. And what we have here is appendix \(D\)
        to your expert report. Do you see that?
    A. I see that.
    Q. And we have also put it on the screen.
    Now, this is the chart where you show what
        all of your metrics are for giving to
        Dr. Hornberger to run the hydrology. Right?
    A. That's correct.
    Q. And on the right-hand side, you have the criteria
        that you gave to Dr. Hornberger. True?
    A. True.
    Q. There is a column for the flow that you need.
        Right?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And then there is a column for the duration of
        that flow?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And then the season in which you would like that
        flow at that duration. Right?
    A. Correct.
    Q. And it's your expert opinion that harm occurs
        anytime flows fall below that combination of
        metrics. Right?
        THE REPORTING GROUP
        Mason \& Lockhart
Q. Okay. Dr. Allan, I want to turn now to tab 16 of the binder. And what we have here is appendix \(D\) to your expert report. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. And we have also put it on the screen.

Now, this is the chart where you show what all of your metrics are for giving to Dr. Hornberger to run the hydrology. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And on the right-hand side, you have the criteria that you gave to Dr. Hornberger. True?
A. True.
Q. There is a column for the flow that you need. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And then there is a column for the duration of that flow?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the season in which you would like that flow at that duration. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And it's your expert opinion that harm occurs anytime flows fall below that combination of metrics. Right?

THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. No, I wouldn't phrase it that way; and I don't believe I phrased it that way in my report. I think I was very clear in my report that harm occurs above and below that threshold, that the threshold is supported by evidence; and it is a reasonable value to use for asking scenario questions using Dr. Hornberger's analysis.

But according to the 2012 biological opinion, they say harm occurs to mussels in the main channel margins, the metric we're looking at, at \(\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}\), at 8,000, and at \(\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}\). And harm becomes more severe as you approach and then pass that threshold.

One has to also take into account the fact that -- that a particular location for mussels might be a little more exposed to the sun or a little less exposed, might be in an area of a steeper bank or a more gradual bank, might be in an area where there is an easy pathway for mussels to migrate and escape.
Q. Doctor, can I just ask you to slow down for the court reporter, please.
A. Thank you.

It might be in a location where mussels could easily escape or not so easily escape. So it's THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
not a knife-edge number where exactly at 6,001 everything is hunky-dory, and at 5999 everything turns belly up. It is a gradation. But we have to pick values, just as all the other analyses have to pick values, at which to do our analysis. And that \(\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}\) value is well supported by evidence of -- that's included in photographic evidence that's in my report.
Q. Dr. Allan, I was really just trying to make a foundation type question. When you give your numbers to Dr. Hornberger and he comes back and says there is a harm day, it's because it doesn't hit these particular metrics. Right?
A. When Dr. Hornberger does the analysis, he has to have a precise number.
Q. That's all I'm asking. If, when he runs the analysis, it doesn't hit this collection of numbers, it says there's a harm day. Correct?
A. Well, I -- I apologize. I understood your question to ask me whether I thought that that was a precise number above which no harm occurs, below which harm does occur. And I want to be clear that that's not the correct interpretation of that number.
Q. Just do we have an understanding if you gave THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


\section*{any -- any quantitative mechanism to show the influence of any water depletions from upstream or any changes in water level that could be meaningfully quantified. So for that reason, my report does not include metrics for the upper section of the river. \\ Q. Thank you. You had a series of questions about your interactions with Dr. Hornberger. Can you remind us who Dr. Hornberger is. \\ A. So Dr. Hornberger is the expert witness on the -on aspects of the hydrology of the system. And \(I\) had known Dr. Hornberger by reputation, but never met him. I had read some of his -- some of his works that had an ecological aspect to them that was relevant to my own work. So I was delighted to find that Dr. Hornberger was the expert hydrologist that would be part of this -- of this case. \\ And I regret that my memory of which conversations I have had with which other people over the course of four years are imperfect. And I think that since my deposition, which caused me to think further on, well, how often had I interacted with Dr. Hornberger and in what manner, I'm now fairly confident I had a second THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart}
conversation with him; but I can't recall the substance of it. I'm now fairly confident that I had conversations with and saw PowerPoint slides prepared by some of his colleagues that were working with him in developing the hydrologic case. And then in addition, with the assistance of attorneys who were coordinating the activity between different experts, there was -- I have seen Dr. Hornberger's charts.

I was beginning to quantify the numbers into the tables that are in my report. And then sometime in early February, I saw a draft report. At the time I believe I looked at it in a cursory manner.

So there was a history of looking at
Dr. Hornberger's work, but it was not hand in glove. It was really he independently developed the hydrologic scenarios. I gave him the biological metrics, and then he actually prepared the charts. And I pulled the tabular numbers from his charts.
Q. Let's put aside the number of times you actually spoke to him. What's your level of confidence in the work Dr. Hornberger performed for you and why?
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A. So Dr. Hornberger is a highly respected hydrologist. And he will be in court, and his credentials will be put forward. But he has an excellent reputation as a leader in this field.

And in my initial conversations with him when I described some of the ways in which we were developing biological metrics, he clearly understood; and he was complimentary about the work that we were doing to develop what I call biological metrics and what the 2012 -- 2016 biological opinion called ecohydrologic metrics, which are very much the same thing.

And he was -- he was appreciative of having some precise numbers because, of course, as a hydrologist, he can't produce any of those graphs or any of those tables if we say there is a mushy number between 5700 and 6500 that we think is important. I can describe why a particular number is important, but he needs a signal value to do his analysis.
Q. Another name that's been mentioned today and earlier in the week is Ms. Helen Light. Who is Ms. Helen Light?
A. So Ms. Helen Light is, as I understand it, a retired USGS scientist who, as I understand it, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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has basically spent her life studying the floodplain forest of the Apalachicola. She was very helpful to me in preparing my testimony. So I traveled on the river with her. I met with her on a number of times. And she was very helpful in being able to point me to key literature in terms of her own work to explain questions I asked so that I could summarize it in my own words.

I have carefully read the papers that have been discussed here; and I think they are -- I think they're very, very solid papers that need to be taken in the context of their writings.
Q. Okay. Let's look at one of the papers that you were shown earlier today. If you look at tab 10 of your cross-examination binder --

MR. QURESHI: And, your Honor, that is Georgia Exhibit 88.
A. Excuse me just a moment.

Sir, is tab 10 the water level decline paper?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Thank you.
Q. May I note that this is a 50-page document, so I'm not going to ask you about the entirety of it. But I do know that there was discussion THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
about one particular sentence on the bottom of page 1, and you were asked to render your opinion on that sentence.

I want to back up a little bit and ask you for your opinion about the entire document and help us place that sentence into context.
A. Help -- I'm sorry?
Q. Help us place that one sentence that you were asked about into context.
A. Yes. So by way of beginning, let me -- let me try to distinguish between, as I understand it, what would be an expert opinion, which might imply that, you know, I have done similar work; I have repeated the work. I have not done that.

I have an opinion as a scientist who is used to reading scholarly papers carefully. And so based on my long experience reading I don't know how many scientific papers carefully and trying to form opinions about the validity, I think this is a very solid paper; and I think Helen Light's work is very reliable.

I'll take the sentence that I was asked to read by Georgia counsel that says, water level decline caused by channel change is probably -underscore probably -- the most serious
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anthropogenic impact that has occurred so far -underline so far -- in the Apalachicola River and floodplain. And then go to the very next sentence of the very same paragraph which is, by the way, a scientific abstract. It's a very concise summary paragraph.

The sentence continues, this decline has been exacerbated by long-term reductions in spring and summer flow, especially during drought periods. Although no trends in total annual flow volumes were detected, long-term decreases in discharge for April, May, July, and August were apparent, and water level declines during drought conditions resulting from decreased discharge in these four months were -- underlined -- similar in magnitude to the water level declines caused by channel changes.

So in effect Ms. Light is saying that the water level declines are -- are about -- due to decreased discharge are about at the same order of magnitude as those caused by channel changes.
Q. Okay. And what is your understanding of that analysis?
A. Well, I would say that what this -- what this study does is it identifies two causes of the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
decline in water levels, one being the channel changes, which my report acknowledges have occurred; and the other being long-term decreases in discharge, which my report focuses on.

The channel changes are 15 years in the past.
The channel is largely stabilized. And so that factor, which was studied in detail by Helen Light, is a factor of the past. The decrease in discharge is something that \(I\) believe Dr. Hornberger convincingly argues is continuing today.

So we have two causes of about equal magnitude in the year 2006 or thereabouts, one of which is no longer occurring, one of which is accelerating.
Q. And how do you know that the channel change is no longer occurring?
A. So from doctor -- so I rely on Dr. Kondolf's report for the argument that channel changes are no longer occurring. He is the expert on geomorphology, and I take that directly from his report.
Q. Okay. Sticking with Ms. Light's paper, if you look at page 44 and the paragraph that begins during drought conditions?
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A. Yes?
Q. I would like you to read that and provide us with your understanding of that paragraph.
A. So at the top of page 44 the paragraph begins, during drought conditions -- it refers to a figure -- total water level declines in April, May, July, and August, the critical -- I'll add, parenthetically, the critical period for biological activity -- are approximately double the decline caused by channel change alone.

And she goes on to use a particular example to demonstrate that that is the case graphically.
Q. And this paper was written in 2006. 10 years later what is your understanding of the phenomenon she's describing?
A. So \(\mathbf{1 0}\) years later, we see from Dr. Kondolf's report evidence that the channel is stabilizing. We know that the navigation activities, dredging, have been -- ended nearly 15 years ago. And from Dr. Hornberger's report, we understand that water withdrawals are continuing to increase.

And I have to -- if I may make one more point from Dr. -- from Ms. Light's report, I would like to read from page 47 where she talks about research needs at the time of her study. And THE REPORTING GROUP
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basically what she points out is that the water
use data were not available to her at that time
to do as thorough a water use analysis. She
points out that the water use was last -- evaluation was last conducted using 1990 data. And in 1990, agricultural, municipal and industrial water use from 1970 to 1990 had shown an increase. She did not have available to her at the time of this writing the continued increase in water use, which is well documented in Dr. Hornberger's report.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Allan. Turning to your expert report, which is at Florida Exhibit 790, please turn to page 35 .
A. Page $\mathbf{3 5}$ of my expert report?
Q. Yes, sir. And the section of this that I would like to focus on is the bottom of the first paragraph that discusses tipping points.
A. That begins incremental changes?
Q. No, no. Right on top of that, the section that discusses tipping points.
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. You were asked why you didn't perform an empirical analysis to determine when the tipping point will occur. Why didn't you do that?
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A. So I didn't -- I didn't do that because to my
knowledge -- and I'm thinking of every possible study I have ever read in every possible ecosystem context. To actually quantify a tipping point in advance of an event occurring is simply not feasible.

So the use of the term tipping point in ecology is widespread. People also use terms like nonlinear change or threshold change. And the implication is that if you push a system far enough, that eventually it won't -- it will not recover.

And a good example for the Apalachicola would be if -- we're not there yet; but if water levels are low enough so that sloughs -- some sloughs simply no longer receive water, they will cease to be sloughs. They will change irreparably.

So you can use it as a -- sort of a verbal model of the kind of profound change that is likely to occur as systems are degraded. And we know from, actually, ecological theory that systems can change dramatically from one form to another.

I guess maybe a plain-language example would be when you cut down a forest and plant a THE REPORTING GROUP
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cornfield. It's not a forest anymore.
Q. Okay.
A. You could imagine getting that forest back, but it's largely an irreversible change.
Q. Okay. So, Dr. Allan, when you write in your expert report, quote, this ecosystem, however, has experienced significant harm from multiple causes, including Georgia's use of water, and further depletions are certain to exceed the tipping point for key features of the river and floodplain ecosystem. Do you still believe that today?
A. I still believe that today. I think that's very true.
Q. Why?
A. I think -- I think it's true because there's a body of evidence in addition to the metrics \(I\) present that make this expectation likely. And, really, I think one can put aside the metrics for a moment and just rely on common sense. A river that receives less and less water is being increasingly harmed because it's receiving less and less water.

What we understand from the study of the ecology of rivers or any ecosystem is that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
there's a range of macrohabitats. Macrohabitats could be things like large sloughs, small sloughs, floodplain lakes, and the like. And within each of those there's microhabitat.

There is a wide range of differences in the kind of sand or stone or substrate that's present, and the exposure to sun or shade or how the temperature changes, whether the water is moving quickly or moving slowly, whether there is a spring that's providing cool water or warm water. This habitat complexity is what underlies biological diversity. You need all of that habitat diversity protected and retained in order to have the biologically diverse system that has all of these different organisms with different ecological niches that are woven together into a food web such that without ever studying the amphibians and reptiles in the system, I can say that as that food web changes, other species are almost certain to be harmed.

And so I would point to the -- the photographic evidence where you can see just a small decline in water and then -- water level, and then water is no longer flowing between pools. Go a little bit lower decline of water, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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do. So a request to have done a population study on each of the \(\mathbf{2 6}\) species of mussels is -- is really in some ways just beyond the pale that one would want to do that.

My charge was to identify whether harm had occurred, not whether species were -- certain species were in jeopardy, really whether harm had occurred on the entire ecosystem. And I do that with the metrics that I used.

There are population data in my metrics, so the young of the year data on fish recruitment are perhaps the most standard and widely respected metric of how a fish population is doing. Whether the population is robust is going to be determined by basically how many babies it produces each year. And so the fish population metrics are the basis for my identifying flow thresholds associated with the fish.

In the case of the floodplain forest, the changes that are described by Helen Light are population data, biomass density per unit area, changes in the forest composition. So there's population data in both of the fishes and the floodplain forest.

There is not population data for the Gulf THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
sturgeon where my metric looks at the extremely rarely collected, but extremely critical early young of the year fish where we simply identify their habitat and feeding needs.

And in the case of the mussels, again, my metric relies on identifying essentially mortality to individuals.
Q. Sir, you talked about the concept of harm. What is harm?

Is it dead mussels in a dried-out slough, or is it something more? What is it?
A. Harm certainly would include dead mussels in a dried-out slough. Harm would include a year of lower than average recruitment to a population of fish, which could occur naturally; but it would be -- I would describe it as harm if the conditions that result in low recruitment can be attributed to human activity. And I believe in this case they can.

So harm could be lower recruitment. Harm could be mortality of adults. Harm can be physiological stress. When mussels are trapped in a flat, small body of water in the channel margin, and the water begins to heat up and the oxygen declines, as the water heats up, those THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
animals begin to move. If they're fortunate, there would be a way out. If they're not fortunate, there won't be a way out. Some individuals will have different physiological tolerance of stress.

So it's everything from physiological stress through direct mortality to loss of reproduction or reduction in reproduction. And, most definitely, it's loss of habitat.
Q. Okay. You were asked about your July 2012 trip to the river. Did you see lower dissolved oxygen when you were out there?
A. No, I did not.
Q. What about increased temperature of the water?
A. I was -- I was simply becoming acquainted with the system; and I wasn't making collections. I didn't have a thermometer or an oxygen probe in my hand. I was -- I was getting essentially a lesson in geography of the river.
Q. Okay.
A. And that's what I was focused on is just understanding the geography of the system.
Q. Is it your testimony that there are elements of harm that are not visible to the naked eye?
A. You would certainly see harm if you visited a THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
slough like Swift Slough after it dried out. And that's the evidence from the EnviroScience publication. So you can visit a location and see dead mussels.

I was not there at that -- at a time when I was taken to see any existing harm. So, again, \(I\) was getting a lesson in geography; and I was not at that point looking at -- looking for direct evidence of harm.
Q. Dr. Allan, my question is is it possible that harm is occurring even though you can't see it?
A. Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. If an individual is -- we did see individuals in shallow pools where it's likely the water was warming up. I -I think it's entirely possible that those mussels were experiencing physiological stress; but that's my human projection on what a mussel might be feeling at that moment.

MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, I'm happy to keep going. I'm also happy to take the morning break, whatever you prefer.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let's take a break.

MR. QURESHI: Thank you, your Honor.
(Time Noted: 10:17 a.m.)
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Q. Magnolia Slough, on the next page?
A. Also in the \(\mathbf{7 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{c f s} \mathbf{- -}\) no. This is in the
        8,000 cfs range.
Q. I'm sorry, 8,000 , you said?
A. Yes. Magnolia Slough looks like it disconnects
        at 8,000.
Q. Okay. Let's fast forward to page 76.
A. 76?
Q. What's the disconnecting range for Dog Slough?
A. 19,000 cfs.
Q. And the same question with respect to Everett Slough?
A. Also at 19,000 cfs.
Q. Now, let's go back to your testimony on page 35, same paragraph, paragraph 45. And I would like you to explain to the Court why you state that the 5700 cfs metric you determined caused harm to mussels is conservative?

We can highlight that sentence for you on the screen.
A. Well, I would say it's conservative because there are clearly a number of sloughs that become disconnected at values well above 5700 cfs. And THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. Maddox Slough?
A. Maddox is also in the \(\mathbf{7 , 0 0 0}\) range.
Q. Magnolia Slough, on the next page?
A. Also in the \(\mathbf{7 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{c f s} \mathbf{- -}\) no. This is in the 8,000 cfs range.
Q. I'm sorry, 8,000 , you said?
A. Yes. Magnolia Slough looks like it disconnects at 8,000.
Q. Okay. Let's fast forward to page 76.
A. 76?
Q. What's the disconnecting range for Dog Slough?
A. 19,000 cfs.
A. This is the Kondolf document?
Q. Yes, sir.

Turn to page 1 and review the first paragraph. Then I would like you to describe your understanding of that paragraph and tell the Court whether you agree with the assessment in paragraph 1.
A. So I see that paragraph. And it is a beautiful paragraph. It is almost poetic language that describes just how exceptionally important the Apalachicola River system is, where the system is the river, the sloughs, the floodplain, and the bay. It describes the recognition that the system has received as a biosphere reserve, a THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
natural estuarine reserve.
And by the way, I have visited that facility for visitors; and it's wonderful. It's a beautifully done facility in its recognition of outstanding Florida water.

I support the statements that are here about the extensive and very special nature of the biological diversity of this system, and it's fully consistent with my understanding of one of the most intact river systems, not just in Florida, but in the southeast United States.
Q. Dr. Allan, I have the same question with respect to the statement on page 2 under the section entitled Respect the River's Ability to Heal Itself.
A. So I read this paragraph; and I am familiar with this concept because I'm -- although I'm not an expert on geomorphology, I have read a substantial amount of the literature, including Dr. Kondolf's writing. And this is really, one could almost say the first principle of river restoration is that the systems can heal themselves. It takes time. But there is natural fluctuations in river level and sediment transport; and over time, as the human influence THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
of dredging fades further back into history, the river will begin to stabilize, begin to recover.

And I have read Dr. Kondolf's expert report in this case, and he describes that extremely well.
Q. Okay. Sir, we'll look at one more excerpt, and then we'll move on to another topic. If you go to page 2 -- I'm sorry, page 22, the same document, there is a section entitled Factors Causing Desiccation of the Apalachicola Floodplain and Sloughs. And I would like you to review the paragraph that begins flows from the watershed. It continues on to page 23.
A. I have seen the paragraph.
Q. Okay. Sir, what is your understanding of what's written here; and what's your reaction to it?
A. So, again, I think a thoughtful and -- and important paragraph in which Dr. Kondolf recognizes that from the hydrologic record, that flows have declined. He identifies the time period of lower flows being April through August, and he points to some of the probable causes occurring upstream in the system. And finally, he concludes that this problem could be equal or an even greater threat to the long-term health of THE REPORTING GROUP
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the floodplain. I assume that he's referring comparatively to the channel changes could be equal or greater threat. The issue of low flows from upstream is beyond the scope of this report.

So it clearly points to the need for that analysis to be done, and it clearly was not part of this report at the time it was completed.
Q. Okay. Dr. Allan, now, let's turn to see what the United States Fish and Wildlife Service says about low flows in the Apalachicola River. I would like you to turn to tab 3 of the cross-examination binder and, in particular, page 56.
A. Tab 3, page 56.
Q. Okay. In the section under low flow, it states, quote, extreme low flows are likely among the most stressful natural events faced by riverine biota. It goes on to say, during low flow, available habitat constricts and portions of the channel become dry. The paragraph ends with, because of the physical and biological harshness of extreme low flow conditions decreasing the magnitude, increasing the duration or increasing the interannual frequency of low flow events is likely to have detrimental effects on native
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riverine biota, including the listed species.
Do you agree with that, Dr. Allan?
A. I agree with that paragraph. It's really an excellent statement. All by itself it tells the story that as there's less water in the system, the system is harmed. And it's not just the listed species, but the native biota that are harmed as well.
Q. All right. Let's turn --
A. That is stated very strongly.
Q. Let's turn to page 44 of the BiOp by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in particular, the section entitled Conservation Recommendations. I want you to read the first recommendation and then tell us whether that's consistent with your expertise as a river ecologist for 45 years.
A. Just the first one on --
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Just the first one.

Again, it's such a clear, commonsense statement that finding alternatives to reduce overall depletions in the basin, particularly the Flint River, which is so important to summer baseline flow in the Apalachicola River, is

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
desperately needed. And here, they're calling for some sort of planning process to identify those opportunities.
Q. And for the record, that paragraph states, quote, identify watershed planning opportunities that would assist in identifying alternatives to reduce overall depletions in the ACF Basin, particularly the Flint River, thereby increasing baseline flow to the Apalachicola River.

\section*{Is that correct?}
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Let's now turn to the 2016 BiOp. And that's behind tab 9 of your cross-examination binder.

In particular, sir, I would like you to go to page 50, the section on low flows.
A. I see it.
Q. Is that -- does that section look familiar to what we just read?
A. It's very, very familiar. And, again, it's an excellent statement of the effects of low flow, losing habitat, drying out of channel, animals are unable to escape, animals perish, exposed to predators, they're exposed to warm water and low oxygen. And mitigating those circumstances is THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart just a crucial need.
Q. Okay. In your field of study, river ecology, sir, is there any debate about this principle?
A. There is no debate about this whatsoever.
Q. All right. Let's move on to page 202 that I believe contains conservation recommendations.

Actually, it starts on page 201 and continues onto page 203.

Sir, can you please read 8 and 9 into the record.
A. Certainly. So the section 14, Conservation Recommendations of the Biological Opinion, September 14, 2016. Item 8 says, identify and implement water conservation measures in the basin to avoid impacts to fish and wildlife resources by working with municipal, agricultural, and industrial water users to reduce consumptive use -- uses to develop additional drought response strategies.

Item 9, assist stakeholders to plan future water management to minimize water consumption, thus minimizing detrimental effects to species.
Q. Are those conservation recommendations consistent with your study and experience?
A. They are absolutely consistent with my study.
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What is needed is water conservation measures that will avoid or minimize impacts on the ecosystem as a whole.
Q. Sir, let's look at your prefiled direct testimony, in particular, paragraph 73, page 58.

I want to focus on the last sentence. It states, using a less conservative remedy scenario that results in greater flows would provide an even greater positive impact on the riverine ecosystem.

Dr. Allan, what is your basis for that
statement?
A. So I make that statement because I'm aware that the remedy scenario that was initially provided to me by Dr. Hornberger was, as I say in my report -- my prefiled, from a few hundred to as much as a thousand cubic feet per second. And that provides particularly strong remedy benefits for -- for those biological harms that I identify at flows in the vicinity of \(\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}\) or \(\mathbf{8 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{c f s}\). As actually Georgia counsel pointed out, although it wasn't identified as such, for those metrics where the harm threshold is \(\mathbf{1 2 , 0 0 0}, 14,000\), \(16,000 \mathrm{cfs}\), the harm -- the remedy is less impactful.
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So, clearly, the benefit of the remedy depends both on the size of the remedy, the amount of water that is found available, and on the threshold where we identify where the system is harmed.

Because so much of the system is harmed in the six to \(\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0} \mathbf{c f s}\) range, the original remedy that Dr. Hornberger developed did provide substantial relief. It is my understanding through informal conversations that an even greater remedy might be potentially available. And, if so, almost certainly \(I\) would want to run the numbers to be confident, but it almost certainly would result in greater benefits. A greater remedy should result in greater benefits.
Q. Let's focus on the last half of that sentence, greater flows would provide an even greater impact on the riverine ecosystem.

Is there any doubt or uncertainty in your mind, sir, about that statement?
A. No doubt whatsoever that more water will benefit the system. And I would point not only to the metrics to substantiate that, but to the -- the various cutoff flows, disconnect flows for sloughs -- for the many, many sloughs, and to the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
detailed microhabitat and the way in which a small amount of water determines whether two pools are connected by flowing water or become isolated from one another.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Allan.

Let's move on to the final topic, and that is mussels. I would like to put up a picture that was shown to you earlier in the week. That's a 2006 photograph from page 29 of Mr. Hoehn's direct testimony. And counsel for Georgia asked you whether Georgia killed the mussels. I'm going to ask you a slightly different question, and that is what is the biological or ecological phenomenon that resulted in these mussels dying?
A. Low flows killed those mussels.
Q. Okay. In the course of questioning from Georgia's counsel, you were asked about the estimates of fat threeridge that currently live in the Apalachicola River. And you expressed some doubt about those estimates in the 2016 BiOp. What informs your uncertainty about the number of fat threeridge mussels in the Apalachicola?
A. So there's several reasons to be very concerned about the estimates that appear in the 2016 BiOp. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

The first is that we generally -- we being the field of aquatic ecology -- consider the main channel of a fine sediment river to be inhospitable to organisms that live on the bottom of the river. The sand is mobile. The fine substrate is mobile. Floods comes through. Things move around. So there are patches within the main channel often associated with, for example, a buried bit of -- piece of log or a buried piece of stump that can create a sheltered area. So there's certainly locations within the main channel where some mussels would be expected to live. But it's well established for a wide range of invertebrates that they are primarily affiliated with the slower water, edges, pools, backwaters, locations of less scouring.

So it's surprising. It's surprising, I think, to everybody to have this claim which has been made and deserves to be investigated.

In addition to it being unexpected that there should be abundant mussels in what's generally considered to be inhospitable habitat, the methodology that was used, this side-scan sonar, was developed to -- basically to look at big things, not little things on the riverbed. And I THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Q. Now, I would like to invite you back to page 56 of tab 2, please. Now, sir, inviting your attention to paragraph 7, if I might, the State should consider subsidies for conversion of permits from surface water to groundwater, as this may be a cost effective way to maintain adequate streamflow in some areas.

Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. Sir, were you aware of that stakeholder recommendation in 2006?
A. I believe I was when I read this document the first time.
Q. All right, sir. Item 9, quote, the statutory requirement that EPD shall issue all new permits should be re-evaluated in order to protect existing users and the resource.

Sir, were you aware of that recommendation in 2006?
A. I'm sure I was since I read the document in 2006.
Q. Now, item 10 reads, quote, alternatives to issuing permits based on rated pump capacity should be explored, unquote. Sir, do you have any understanding of that recommendation?
A. I can read the words. I think I understand what THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

\section*{it means.}
Q. All right, sir. If you could keep that in mind, we'll come back to that issue a little bit later today.

Now, if I could invite your attention to page
67, please. Are you with me, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Do you see a picture of a blue-hole spring on that page?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. And I would invite your attention to the text in the first full paragraph on that page which reads, quote, groundwater discharges to streams directly through the stream bed or stream banks, but it may also be added in large quantities from in-channel springs.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And then down past the beautiful photograph there, at the bottom of the page the text reads, quote, some blue-hole springs have substantial discharges on the order of tens of millions of gallons per day. For example, the flow of Radium Springs in Albany, Georgia, has been measured at 49,000 gallons per minute, 70.6 mgd .
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Sir, have you ever been to Radium Springs?
A. I have.
Q. Okay. The text continues, quote, however, as a result of drought and increased withdrawals, Radium Springs went dry in 1981 for the first time in recorded history and has been going dry more frequently since then.

Sir, have you ever seen Radium Springs in a dry condition?
A. I don't believe I have.
Q. Okay, sir. Now, sir, are you aware of the reaction from U.S. Fish and Wildlife to the proposed fish plan before Georgia finalized it?
A. No.
Q. Sir, if I might invite your attention to the second document -- I'm sorry, the third document in your binder at tab 3. It's Florida Exhibit 46. Do you see there, sir, a letter from the United States Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service to Mr. Rob McDowell?
A. Yes.
Q. And who is Mr. Rob McDowell?
A. He was an employee of the Georgia Environmental Protection Division.
Q. Okay.

\section*{THE REPORTING GROUP}
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A. He was involved in assisting with the development of the Flint River Water Development Conservation Plan.
Q. All right, sir. If I could invite your attention to the second page of FX-46, please, and the second paragraph in particular. I'm going to invite your attention in particular to a series of sentences that begin in the end of the fifth line. And so I'll start reading, sir. And please interrupt me if you're not with me.

Quote, the agricultural use data included in the report indicated -- have I lost you, sir?
A. Which paragraph are you on?
Q. I'm sorry, sir. My fault. It's the second paragraph on page --
A. Second full paragraph on page 2?
Q. Oh, you're right. I should have clarified that. It is the first full paragraph, the second paragraph.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. Thank you for that question.

So, sir, the text beginning at the end of the fifth line reads, quote, the agricultural use data included in the report indicate a current use, see, e.g., page 61, that has at times dried THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


To Mr. Butler you write, quote, you asked how it came that the legislature ordered EPD to regulate agricultural wells 11 years ago, but never gave us money to do the job. First, it is not an unusual circumstance that the General Assembly would give EPD an unfunded mandate. It happens again and again. Second, for the first several years of this 11-year time period, EPD was operating under the belief that we would not run out of water for farmers anywhere in south Georgia, and given that the law is extremely lenient with regard to agricultural permitting and water use, we essentially just issued permits for any farmer who requested them. Since we had so many applications and so few staff to handle them, we made it a simple paper exercise. We had no resources to go to the field and verify what the farmer claimed in his application was so. But we also thought, incorrectly, that there -that since there was so much groundwater, it was no great problem that we were understaffed.

Sir, did you write that text?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you wrote that text, you intended it to be accurate?
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A. I did.
Q. Okay, sir. Now, sir, if I might ask you to turn to tab 6. And there is also an exchange of letters at tab 6. Do you see those, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I would like, if I might, to invite you to turn to the last letter in this packet addressed to you and Mr. Hallum. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And this is FX-2, Florida Exhibit 2.

So, sir, do you see Mr. Butler's name in the signature block on that letter?
A. I do.
Q. And, again, Mr. Butler was a member of the Board to whom you reported?
A. That's correct.
Q. So Mr. Butler writes in the first paragraph of this letter, quote, either by letter or in conversation, Harold has noted the anticipated need to put some limits on farm wells in the Flint River Basin in southwest Georgia. I would like more information on that issue generally.

Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. All right, sir. Might you turn with me, please, THE REPORTING GROUP
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to the first page of the first -- of the text in the first letter in this packet at tab 6, Florida Exhibit 2. Now, sir, I will read a couple of selections here; and I will have questions about them.

In the second paragraph in the letter do you see there is a sentence that begins -- about the middle that begins with the words the sections?

Sir, I could describe it in a little more detail if that would be helpful; or Mr. Walton might be able to highlight it. It begins, the sections of the laws that require farmers to have permits are the weakest of all Georgia's environmental laws.

Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. You wrote that?
A. I did.
Q. All right, sir. It goes on, the original bills were specifically written in a very loose manner to place the minimum amount of requirements on agricultural water users, because the wisdom at that time was that the General Assembly would not accept more than that in regulating farmers.

Do you see that, sir?
THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. I do.
Q. You wrote that as well; didn't you?
A. I did.
Q. All right. Now, if I might invite your attention to the next paragraph, it begins, quote, EPD was given no new money or personnel with which to operate the permit program, so we have done it on a shoestring for years. We basically have had one professional assigned to review applications and issue permits, unquote. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. All right.
A. And that was correct up until about 1997. The first nine years of the program we didn't have a drought going in the state. We thought we had plenty of resources. Once we started seeing the products of the comprehensive study on the ACF, we recognized that we might have a problem in the Flint. And I started diverting other resources to agricultural activities in that part of the state.
Q. Yes, sir. We will cover those issues in great depth during our time today, so I appreciate your -- your point. And I will certainly get to THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. I do.
Q. And do you see your name there appears in the to line?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Now, in the text it says, quote, I am writing to invite technical staff of your choosing to meet with me so that I might transfer to you some data analysis tools that the Service has developed, end quote. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And then there is a reference in the next sentence to indicators of hydraulic alteration. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. But you don't recall working with the IHA analysis when you were director?
A. I remember that Fish and Wildlife Service worked with the IHA analysis and advocated for it. I didn't remember what IHA stood for until I saw this particular letter.
Q. Okay. Thank you, sir.

If I might invite your attention now to tab 11. And there is a document titled, quote, Reheis Statement For Southwest Georgia Summit, April 16, 1999. Sir, do you recall this THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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document?
A. Yes.
Q. You created this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And you delivered an address to the Southwest Georgia Summit with the information presented in this document?
A. To the best of \(m y\) recollection, \(I\) did.
Q. All right, sir. I invite your attention to the fourth paragraph that begins I do believe. Do you see that, sir?
A. That looks like the second paragraph to me, but I see one that says \(I\) do believe.
Q. Yes. That -- you're correct. It's the second large paragraph. I was counting the first two sentences as a paragraph.
A. Oh, sorry.
Q. So let me read that, if I might; and then I'll ask you a question or two. Quote, I do believe that the State will need to put a cap on water depletions one of these days from the Floridan Aquifer to keep water flowing in the Lower Flint in drought years, but EPD will continue to evaluate options for the best way to limit aquifer depletions, and we will not institute a
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moratorium at this time.
Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. All right. And you composed it -- this particular statement?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, sir, have you at any recent point had access to the Georgia agricultural permitting data base?
A. No.
Q. Are you aware of how many permits or how many acres in the Flint River Basin were issued between the date of this statement and the date in which EPD imposed a restriction on -- or a moratorium a granting new applications?
A. How many permits were issued between --
Q. Let me rephrase, sir.
A. -- this date and the date of --
Q. The moratorium.
A. -- the moratorium?

No, I don't recall.
Q. Sir, are you aware that there were applications for permitted acreage exceeding 100,000 new acres received by EPD between April 16, 1999, and December of 1999?
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A. I don't remember the exact number. I know we had a number of applications. Having applications is different than granting permits.
Q. Isn't it true, sir, that by 2000, permits for more than 100,000 more acres of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin had been granted by EPD?
A. I don't recall the numbers.
Q. All right. Now, you did put a restricted moratorium on granting new applications in place; but that didn't occur until December or late November of 1999. Isn't that correct?
A. November 30, 1999, as I recall.
Q. All right. So is it not true that a large number of applicants presented new applications for irrigation permits before that moratorium took place?
A. Yes, it is true.
Q. And isn't it true that EPD granted many of those applications?
A. I believe EPD granted some applications out of a backlog of \(\mathbf{2 5 0 0}\) or so applications.
Q. Was it 881 applications, sir?
A. The number \(I\) have got in mind is 864.
Q. And you're not aware right now how many acres THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
were allowed to be irrigated under those newly-granted permits. Right?
A. I am not.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, if I might invite your attention to the exhibit at tab 13, please. And let me ask you, as you identify this document in the binder, whether you were present when we played deposition designations of Napoleon Caldwell earlier this week?
A. I was not.
Q. Okay. Napoleon Caldwell worked for you when you were director; is that correct?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Steve Whitlock worked for you?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Can you describe Steve Whitlock's role, please?
A. He was an engineer. He did some modeling relative to hydrology in our water resources program. Some of it dealt with the ACF.
Q. Sir, might I -- at tab 13 -- and it's FX-4 -invite your attention to the third page of this document. Now, sir, under Consequences of Water Overuse on that page, do you see the line that reads, quote, status quo in issuing new irrigation permits will lead to an overcommitment THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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of water resources and overuse of the resource, unquote. Do you see that, sir?
A. I see that.
Q. All right, sir. And then in numbered item 3 on that same page at the very bottom, if you look at that particular item, there is a semicolon in the middle of the parenthetical. And after that semicolon, the name Steve Whitlock, whom you just identified, is mentioned. Quote, from information provided by Steve Whitlock, we have already exceeded the safe upper limit of permittable acreage in the Flint?

Do you see that, sir?
A. I see it.
Q. All right. If you could just with me now turn back to the first page of FX-4 at tab 13. Do you see the date?
A. I see a date.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, I believe you just testified that the moratorium wasn't granted until November 30 of this same year. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So nine months passed between the time of these talking points and the issuance of the moratorium. Correct?
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A. No. That would be a little over eight months.
Q. That's fair. Thank you, sir.

If I might invite your attention to page 7 of
this document, FX-4, please. And, sir, I would
like to invite your attention to some very specific text on this page. It's in bold. It's in item No. 3 on page 7 of FX-4. And it's in parentheses. And it reads, quote, Harold, we need to further discuss this bullet before we finalize the document. It could very well be that we have to say we can't issue any more permits, regardless of when the applications were submitted.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. You don't recall who wrote that in this document?
A. No, I don't. I don't recall who wrote the document. It's clearly a draft, work-in-progress. It has blanks and parentheticals in it. I don't remember who wrote it. I don't remember if it ever got finalized.
I don't remember to what extent it was used by EPD.
Q. All right. You weren't here for the deposition designations by video of Napoleon Caldwell a few THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. That's what I said. I was not here.
Q. Thank you, sir.

Now, if I might invite your attention to page 6 of the same document, please. And at the top there, item 3 reads, quote, if new irrigation uses are not limited effectively and soon, it will create a bigger Achilles heel than we currently have.

Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. All right. So the next phrase is also, I think, something that I would like to ask you about. Quote, in the worst case, state government would have to buy back water rights from farmers, unquote. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. That was a concept that was under consideration throughout 1999. Correct?
A. You said that was a concept that --
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I don't know. I don't recall that.
Q. We'll get to the Flint River Drought Protection Act and the irrigation auction in a minute, but is it not fair to say that the Flint River THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart

Drought Protection Act was an effort to buy back water from its farmers?
A. No, it did not buy back water rights from farmers.
Q. It bought back rights -- it bought rights temporarily; is that fair?
A. It temporarily bought rights to get a farmer to not irrigate.
Q. All right. And you're drawing a distinction, which I appreciate, being a temporary purchase of the right to irrigate versus a permanent purchase of the right to irrigate. Is that correct?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. Now, just down from the text I read there is a numbered item 1. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And there is a reference to Kansas versus Colorado there; and I would like to read it, if I might. Quote, in Kansas versus Colorado, the Supreme Court found Colorado liable for violating the river water Compact because it had permitted so much groundwater use for farmers that their usage reduced the river flowage into Kansas. Colorado was forced to buy out farmers' water rights, granted through state permits, in order THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to comply with its state line delivery commitments in the Compact, at a cost of, blank, million. This could happen to Georgia if we cannot deliver on an allocation formula commitment due to overuse by agriculture.
Do you see that, sir?
A. I see it.
Q. And in this context, an allocation formula was currently being negotiated under the ACF Compact. Correct?
A. You said in this context?
Q. Fair point.
A. That is not a context for negotiation of the formula.
Q. Fair point.
A. During that time period we were negotiating the formula.
Q. Thank you, sir. You fixed my question.

Now, the next point reads, quote, presumably, if Georgia users dry up the Flint in droughts, then Florida, or federal agencies, or other Georgia shareholders, could also take the State to court and perhaps compel the buy-back of farmers' water permits.
Do you see that, sir?
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\section*{A. I see the words.}
Q. You don't recall any discussion of that particular point in 1999?
A. I don't recall any specific discussions, nor do I know whether or not any of this was correct. I didn't check it out. These were the opinions of whomever drafted this thing. And as I said, I don't even know if it ever became final or if it was ever used.
Q. All right, sir. Let's focus on something you did draft then, if we might, please. And here, I'm referring to your prefiled direct testimony. And that's paragraph 51. That's the testimony that Mr. Primis handed you earlier today.

Now, sir, this paragraph relates to the -- to what's identified in the third line, reverse irrigation auction. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And that's a reference to the -- what ultimately became the Flint River Drought Protection Act. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there was a voluntary auction component there and an involuntary auction component. Right?
A. If you're talking about the Flint River Drought THE REPORTING GROUP
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654 Management Act, there is not in this paragraph or this context an involuntary component that I see. This is talking about a voluntary component.
Q. Okay, sir. We'll come back to the voluntary/involuntary component in a minute when we look at the actual Flint River Drought Protection Act. But for now, if I could invite your attention to the last sentence of paragraph 51 that you have before you, quote, but because the auction concept involved compensating farmers for ceasing to irrigate, it served to alleviate the economic hardships that would be imposed by issuance of interruptable permits and also made it much less likely that farmers would irrigate when they should not.

You wrote that, sir; didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, I would like to focus on the words when they should not, when farmers should not irrigate. And you reference here in paragraph 51 to an occasion in a dry or drought year when the Flint River Drought Protection Act would be implemented. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, if I might invite your
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attention to tab 15, please. Do you see J -Joint Exhibit 9 there at tab 15, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. All right, sir. If I might invite your attention to -- and I'll give you two indications of where it is, section 12-5-546, which is on page 7 of 12.
A. I'm there.
Q. Sorry. I just wanted to make sure you were there, sir.

Do you see subsection (a) on 12-5-546?
A. I do.
Q. Quote, on or before March 1 of each year the division will issue a prediction as to whether severe drought conditions are expected during the year.

Sir, you agree with me, don't you, that it's feasible to predict drought by March 1 of every year?
A. Yes. I think we believe that, which is why that language got into the Act.
Q. Okay, sir. Now, the second component there, (b), of 12-5-546 reads, quote, if severe drought conditions are predicted or otherwise declared in accordance with subsection (a) of this code THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
section, the Division will determine the total number of acres of irrigated land serviced by irrigation systems located within one or more of the affected areas that must not be irrigated that year in order to maintain the acceptable Flint River streamflow.

> Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. Now, the next sentence begins, upon such determination, the Division shall conduct an irrigation reduction auction whereby a permittee of an irrigation system located within the affected areas is given an opportunity to enter into an agreement with the Division.

\section*{Do you see that?}
A. I do.
Q. Okay, sir. Now, focusing on that word permittee, could you please turn back with me to page 4 of 12. And do you see the definition of the term permittee there?
A. Yes.
Q. And those are permits that existed and have been granted before the time of the Flint River Drought Protection Act. Right?
A. Yes.

\section*{THE REPORTING GROUP}
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Q. So those were existing irrigation users that would be subject to this auction authority. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, sir, we just looked at section 12-5-546; but I would like to turn with you to the involuntary section, which is 12-5-547.

And in particular, I'll start with the line that's marked 8-37. Quote, if the director determines that the total number of nonirrigated acres needed during a given year cannot be sufficiently obtained through the irrigation reduction auction held in accordance with code section 12-5-546, the director is authorized to issue an Order, in accordance with rules adopted by the Board, requiring certain permittees not to irrigate a specified number of acres of irrigated land until the end of the calendar year.

Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. That provision has never been invoked, as far as you know; isn't that right?
A. It was never invoked while I was director of EPD.
Q. Okay. That's fair, sir.

Now, sir, could we please turn to tab 16, THE REPORTING GROUP
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3 A. I do.
Q. Allan Hallum worked for you?
A. He did.
Q. Could you describe his role, please?
A. He was the chief of the water protection branch which administered the water quality control programs from the State of Georgia under state law and the Clean Water Act.
Q. All right, sir. And on the second page of the document titled Water Messages, do you see your name there?
A. It is.
Q. Sir, did you give an address to a group in north Georgia with the message that is identified under items 1 through 3 there?
A. I don't recall any specific address to a group in north Georgia with those items 1, 2, and 3. I may have. I just don't recall.
Q. All right. Let me walk through a few of the sentences to see if this might jog your memory, sir.

Under item 1 it reads, quote, over the past two decades, substantial population growth in THE REPORTING GROUP
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Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint Compact
Commission and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa
Compact Commission. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And it's dated February 18, 1998?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, did you attend that inaugural meeting, sir?
A. I can't imagine that I did not attend it. So I don't recall, but I expect I was there.
Q. Now, sir, I want to focus on just a bit of text here under -- in the what's labeled Remarks of Governor Zell Miller from that date.

On the first page about four paragraphs from the bottom, it talks about we fully recognize.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Quote, we fully recognize that Florida has a very real and significant interest in the future of the Apalachicola Bay and its surrounding environmental ecosystems, and in her other uses of water, unquote. Sir -- do you, sir, have any reason to believe that that message was not genuine at the time it was delivered?
A. No.
Q. All right, sir. Now, again, in the remarks of
A. I don't recall. It's a statement that's written in these notes. I don't remember if I made that statement to DOJ or not.

MR. PERRY: Mr. Walton?
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. Sir, do you remember when we discussed this very specific set of notes during your deposition?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Now, I can play the clip in a moment; but I would like to identify another bullet first. So two bullets down, do you see where it says, federal commissioners can veto a bad formula so it's incumbent on the States to do it right.

\section*{Do you see that, sir?}
A. I do.
Q. That was intended to be an accurate observation at the time you took these notes. Right?
A. Yes. In fact, that language was in the Compact that the States had passed.
Q. Okay. So, sir, back up on the prior quote, this isn't a 50 year old western states Compact, I would ask if you recall during your deposition that you were under oath. Do you recall that; right?
A. Yes, I was.
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Q. Okay, sir.

MR. PERRY: Now, Mr. Walton?
Your Honor, may I approach and hand the witness the transcript?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I think this is -- I think this is more of a refreshing recollection situation than an impeachment situation. Mr. Perry can proceed however he wants, but I object to this.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
MR. PERRY: Your Honor, that's a fair point. I'm happy to refresh the recollection with the transcript if that's something the witness will engage in now.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. So, sir, can I ask you, please, to turn to page 221.
A. I have it.
Q. And if I might, I point you first to page 220. And on line 20 of that page, question. Back on the first page, which I can read pretty well, about a little farther than midway down, you write a sentence, quote, this isn't a 50 year old western states Compact where diversions are THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
allowed to dry up whole rivers. The vast majority of the ACT/ACF water will stay where it is.

Do you see that?
Answer. I see that.
Do you recall what you meant by that statement?

Answer. Well, I think that was a point that we wanted to clarify or reassure DOJ and the other federal representatives on. There were to my understanding Compacts among the western states which completely appropriated the water of certain rivers to the point that they dried up. And I must have thought that somebody in DOJ or other federal representatives might have thought such a thing could happen in this case, and so I made the comment that that's not what this is. And the way the laws have changed in this country, you can't do that anymore.

Sir, do you recall that testimony?
A. I do now.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, sir, I would like to invite your attention to the next tab, which is 21. And here, sir, I'm not sure that I'm as competent as you are to read your handwriting. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

So, first, let me ask, can you confirm that's
your handwriting, sir?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. All right. Would you please read to the Court the first four paragraphs of your handwritten notes on this page.
A. If we tell Corps what we really want and they start using it in their open EIS process, it becomes public early.

Florida and Alabama might be scared off. Compacts may get scuttled.

Alabama and Florida will learn sooner or later what we want, and won't like it. Big question is should they know sooner or later, after Compacts pass.

One advantage of getting low end of rains cranked in and evaluated early is we get to see and influence what the impacts are, and see Florida and Alabama reactions to them. Depending on their reactions, we can anticipate what we need to adjust for negotiations.
Q. Sir, you wrote these notes before the federal Compact passed Congress. Right?
A. It appears that \(I\) did, yes, sir.
Q. And in that first paragraph, you read where it THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
Q. And they were involved in the negotiations to some extent at least. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And your reference there to an open EIS process is a reference to the environmental impact statement process. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would require notice and comment from the Army Corps. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in the next line you write, Florida and Alabama might be scared off, Compacts may get scuttled. Did you mean by scuttle that the Compacts may never pass?
A. I don't remember what \(I\) meant at that time. But what I was trying to do was to think through a complex issue. I assume that the Compacts would be ratified by Congress and that we would be negotiating. And I was starting to think, as I assume that Florida and Alabama were starting to think, about how we would form an allocation agreement, an allocation formula.
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Q. Now, sir -- I'm sorry, sir.
A. Because we didn't have very long to do it. We would have a year after the Congress ratified it.
Q. Well, so, sir, by this point in time when the Compacts were on the verge of passing Congress, Florida, and Alabama, Georgia, and the federal government had already been involved for roughly seven years in a comprehensive study of all of the consumption, agricultural, municipal, industrial, and other issues relating to the ACF Basin. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right, sir. So the next sentence that's written there reads, Florida and Alabama will learn sooner or later what we want, and won't like it. Big question is should they know sooner or later, after the Compacts pass?

You wrote that; didn't you?
A. I did.
Q. All right, sir. So if I might invite your attention, please, to FX-212, which is at tab 22. And, sir, this is a letter signed by Douglas Barr. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe who Douglas Barr was, please.
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A. He was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water Management District.
Q. Was he negotiating for Florida or providing technical advice to Florida as part of the ACF Compact negotiations?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. And this is a letter to you. Right?
A. It is.
Q. From August 13, 1998?
A. That's right.
Q. And that is roughly nine months after the Compact passed. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So I would like to invite your attention to the second paragraph and, indeed, the second sentence in that paragraph where Mr. Barr writes, quote, from our perspective, as the downstream state, however, we are concerned that over the past two to three months we have been presented with new and significantly higher demand sets for the municipal and industrial water needs for the Georgia portion of the basin and the new reservoir operating rules and procedures that have not been discussed during the course of the last six years of study.
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\section*{Do you see that, sir?}
A. I do.
Q. And it's true, isn't it, that Georgia only provided those new demand sets after the federal Compact passed. Right?
A. I expect that's true. I don't remember exactly when we first put our M \& I demands on the table, but most likely after the federal Compact passed.
Q. Now, sir, if I might invite your attention to tab 23, which is a letter from 1999 from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. And, sir, might I ask you to identify the Honorable Lindsey Thomas who is the -- who is the recipient of this letter?
A. He was the person appointed by the President as federal commissioner for the ACT/ACF River Basin Commissions.
Q. And you were acquainted with Mr. Thomas through this process; were you not?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, you received this letter as a technical adviser and negotiating on behalf of Georgia. Right?
A. I don't see myself shown as receiving a carbon copy of it. I don't know if \(I\) received it or not.
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Q. All right, sir. On the last page, do you see the name Gail Carmody?
A. I do.
Q. All right. And she was with U. S Fish and Wildlife?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were familiar with her as well?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Now, sir, if I might invite your attention -- and this is Florida Exhibit 35a at tab 23 -- to the second page under Drought Management, in there U.S. Fish and Wildlife writes, this issue is critical to the Service's interest in the ACF. Physical habitat conditions under droughts likely represent the limiting conditions for many riverine aquatic species in the basin. Flow depletions due to consumptive uses and reservoir evaporative losses may exacerbate these extreme conditions by further decreasing flow magnitude during droughts and by increasing their frequency and duration. We have recommended that the States negotiate consumptive use limits and reservoir operations as part of the allocation formula, and these limits in operations should be adjusted during drought. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. Do you recall U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
asserting that position as part of the ACF
Compact negotiations?
A. I don't recall specifically, no. I don't.
Q. Well, let's try a different letter, if we might, sir, at tab 24. And at that tab do you see a letter, again, to Mr. Lindsey Thomas, federal commissioner?
A. I do.
Q. And do you see the signature from -- of John, I believe it's Harkinson, Jr., regional administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency?
A. It's Hankinson.

Yes, I see it.
Q. Thank you for that correction, sir.

Now, sir, if I might, in this letter I would like to ask you if you recall receiving this one?
A. I don't recall it.
Q. Well, let's talk about whether you're aware of EPA Region 4's views. So let's turn to page 2 of this 1999 letter, and I invite your attention in particular to Basin Adequate Flows. And there it THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
reads, quote -- in the middle of the page -adequate flows for the basins which preserve the biological, chemical, and physical integrity of the basins need to be established. This includes seasonal flow variations. Streamflow characteristics necessary to support the existing aquatic communities must be maintained to preserve the designated uses of the rivers in these basins. Sufficient flow must remain in each stream under all anticipated conditions to support a balanced, diverse, and indigenous population of aquatic biota. There should be no expected diminution in the population numbers of these biota due to any proposed reduction in water flow. There should be no expected reduction of the quantity or quality of sports or commercial fisheries as a reduction of flow reductions authorized by the Compacts.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. You were aware that was the position of EPA at this time?
A. I -- I don't recall. I -- I don't recall seeing this letter.
Q. Now, sir, let's focus on a slightly different THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
issue. Just above what I read where it says, NPDES compliance -- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

Do you see where I am, sir?
A. Sure.
Q. And, now, there it reads, quotes, no proposal shall result in noncompliance of permitted dischargers.

This is a Clean Water Act issue; is it not?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Then it goes on, quote, minimum flows anticipated to result from any allocation formula must be consistent with minimal flow assumptions underlying each currently issued NPDES permit.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware of that position by EPA?
A. I wasn't aware of the position, but it doesn't surprise me in that it's simply part of their requirements under the Clean Water Act.
Q. Are you familiar, sir, with the Clean Water Act NPDES related criteria for the Bainbridge Gage --
A. No.
Q. -- in Flint River?
A. No.
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Q. Would you be surprised to learn that Georgia has violated those criteria year after year after year since 2000?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, sir. Let's, sir, if we might, take a look at tab 27, please. And there do you see a letter signed by you?
A. I do.
Q. Florida Exhibit 219. Is this a letter you wrote to Mr. Struhs of Florida's Department of Environmental Protection and Mr. Trey Glen of the Alabama Department of Environmental and Community Affairs?
A. Yes.
Q. And the purpose of this letter was to provide Alabama and Florida with your best information about the quantity of agricultural irrigation acreage in the Flint River Basin?
A. Acreage and water use in the Flint River Basin, yes.
Q. And also in the Chattahoochee River Basin?
A. That was included in the data, yes.
Q. All right, sir. So might I invite your attention to the ninth page of the attachment to the letter, which is titled Draft Status Report.

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Again, this is FX-219.
And, sir, do you see a subtitle there,
Summary and Conclusions?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I want to first focus on the sentences just above that, if I might. And in that paragraph just above the Summary and Conclusions, it reads, quote, for these reasons, while Georgia agrees that 8 inches per acre per year is an adequate estimate of water use in a normal rainfall year, we must assume higher numbers while planning future water use in dry years.

And then another sentence a little bit later, the last sentence in that paragraph reads, quote, a safe and appropriate estimate for average irrigation during dry years in the ACF Basin in Georgia is 80 percent above the normal year number, or 14.4 inches per acre per year.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it not true that inside, internally to EPD, there was a recommendation from your staff that the State of Georgia could cap irrigation use at 15 inches per acre per year in the Flint River Basin?
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\section*{A. I don't recall.}
Q. Okay, sir. Now, let's look at the Summary and Conclusions section, if we might. And, there again, I would like to look at the last paragraph of that section where it reads, combining figures for map and farmer-verified acres with unmapped, but permanent acres, Georgia has determined that there are 714,739 acres of irrigated farmland in the Flint River Basin and 68,741 acres of irrigated farmland in the Chattahoochee River Basin. There are an additional 142,986 acres of farmland in the Flint River Basin awaiting irrigation permits from Georgia EPD. Thus, Georgia will require irrigation of more than 920,000 acres of farmland in the Flint and Chattahoochee River basins.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. You intended that to be accurate and the best information that you could provide at the time you wrote it. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware that Georgia's experts in this case are now taking the position that the number of irrigated acres is substantially less?
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\section*{A. No, I'm not aware of that.}
Q. Okay. Now, sir, in recent years you worked with an individual -- a client of yours named Mr. Pine; is that correct?
A. David Pine?
Q. David Pine.
A. I did.
Q. And the subject matter of that engagement in recent years was the proposal related to a topic called aquifer storage and recovery. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe for the Court what that means.
A. Aquifer storage and recovery is a way of storing water underground in appropriate geologic formations. After treating the water to make sure -- if it needs treatment, to make sure it is pure, it is pumped down into an aquifer, stored there until such time that it may be needed later, and then pumped back out for whatever that use was.
Q. And you're familiar -- let me ask you first. Do you mind if I call that ASR for now?
A. That's fine with me.
Q. So you're aware, aren't you, that Florida employs THE REPORTING GROUP
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```

    of declared drought responses. Do you see those,
        sir?
    ```
    down in the box at the bottom, there are a list
    A. Yes.
    Q. Those are for municipal and industrial activities
    in Georgia. Right?
    A. That's correct.
    Q. So in years where drought is declared in a city or in a metro area, the State needs to determine which, if any, of these declared drought responses to utilize; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And in 2007, in fact, this authority was used to reduce outdoor water use; was it not?
A. I believe it was. I don't remember the time of year, but I think 2007 was correct. And I had been retired from EPD for four years when that happened.
Q. Yes, sir. And the only reason I'm asking about this is because it appears in your prefiled direct testimony.
A. Okay.
Q. So, sir, are you aware whether or not Georgia exercised this outdoor water use authority in 2011 or 2012 to reduce the use of water in metro THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Atlanta or anyplace else in Georgia?
A. I don't remember for certain, but \(I\) think that it was.
Q. Do you know where?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you think it should have been, whether it was or not?
A. I said I think it may have been, but I do not recall.
Q. Okay, sir. I would invite your attention now, please, to page 17 of this same tab. And, sir, do you see section 4B, agricultural drought response?
A. Yes.
Q. All right, sir. It reads, quote, implement the Flint River Drought Protection Act whenever severe drought conditions are predicted in the Flint River Basin. Measure and improve the effectiveness of the protective activities called for by the Act. And then it has some brackets, with EPD, there. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Now, sir, the Flint River Drought Protection Act to your knowledge has never been exercised since 2003; isn't that correct?
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A. Well, exercise of the law involves a number of things. A drought reduction auction is one of those.
Q. Well, let's focus on that then.
A. In 2001 and 2002 we conducted drought reduction auctions. Since then, I don't recall one being conducted. But when you say it has never been exercised or never been implemented -- the Act -the Act is there. And EPD looks at it every year, I believe, to determine whether or not to declare a drought and whatever other requirements there may be.

Sometime in recent years, I think 2014, the Act was amended; and there are some new requirements on agricultural use in the Flint River Basin. I'm -- I assume those are being implemented. I don't have that information.
Q. So, sir, I recognize you haven't been there since 2003; so my question is about dates after 2003 when the document we're looking at was issued. So let me refine that and ask you a slightly different question.

Do you know if in 2007 there was a severe drought?
A. If you mean there was a severe drought declared THE REPORTING GROUP
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under the Flint River Drought Protection Act by the EPD director, I don't know.
Q. Sir, were you here yesterday when we played the video clips on that topic from former Director Turner?
A. I was not here.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, there's another portion of your prefiled direct testimony that deals with legislation passed in 2003 regarding flow meters on irrigation withdrawals.
A. Yes.
Q. All right, sir. Now, do you know what percentage of irrigation withdrawals are metered in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee area?
A. I do not know the percentage.
Q. Would it surprise you to learn that it's 53 percent?
A. It would. But it sounds --
Q. And that's because --
A. That sounds low.
Q. And that's because you believe it's higher?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, are you aware that there has been no funding provided by the State of Georgia for installation and maintenance of flow meters THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
for some time?
A. No, I'm not privy to the budget of the state; and I don't know what it has provided for that.
Q. Do you know Mr. Eigenberg, David Eigenberg?
A. I do know a David Eisenberg.
Q. My fault. Eisenberg.

Would that individual have responsibility for flow meters and related issues?
A. I think he did at one time. I don't know if he still does.
Q. Now, sir, in your testimony at page 34 or so -31, pardon me -- you write that some of your former memoranda or statements in writing may have, quote, overstated the risks. Now, you never expressed this concern to me during our deposition; did you?

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I --
A. Where are you now?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Excuse me. MR. PRIMIS: I object to the question. He was asked whether he expressed something at his deposition, which is an improper question.

MR. PERRY: All right. I'll withdraw
it, your Honor, and ask a different question.
THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. Now, sir, you haven't seen a document today that you wrote that you believe was inaccurate when you wrote it. Right?
A. I thought that any document \(I\) was doing was accurate. There are qualifiers to that. And I think what \(I\) expressed and you just read is a qualifier that at times, although \(I\) intended to be truthful about everything, I may have overstated the risks. And drying up the Flint River is one of those overstatements that I made a number of times.

Thank goodness the Flint River has never dried up and thank goodness our concerns about the model being not accurate in that regard were correct.

It was not accurate. The Flint River hasn't dried up. But I did say that again and again because that was something that came out of the model.
Q. Now --
A. So while it was truthful that it came out of the model, it was an overstatement based on the -the rudimentary nature of the model and the lack THE REPORTING GROUP
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of good data that was in the original model runs.
Q. Now, you're referring to the United States Geological Survey model that you said --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So, sir, you remember about two hours ago, maybe two and a half hours ago we talked about your OpEd. Right?
A. About what? The OpEd?
Q. The OpEd, yes, sir.

And there I think you told me not long ago and in your deposition, too, that although the Flint River itself hasn't yet dried up, many major Flint tributaries have over miles of length.

That was a true statement; wasn't it?
A. I believe that was true.
Q. Okay.
A. It's also true that the Flint River didn't dry up.
Q. Sir, what was the lowest year in the history of flow -- measured flows for the Flint River at the Bainbridge Gage?
A. I do not know.
Q. Okay. What was the lowest year in the history of flows for the Flint River at the Newton Gage? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

\section*{A. I do not know.}
Q. Do you know the lowest year in the history of the Spring Creek Gage at Iron City?
A. I do not know.
Q. Did the Spring Creek Gage at Iron City ever reach zero while you were director?
A. It may have, but \(I\) don't know.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of any time in history prior to the last 15 years when the Spring Creek Gage was zero for a month at a time?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Thank you, sir.

MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we're about \(2: 20\). And I would invite Georgia to suggest a break. But if that's appropriate, I can suggest it, too.

MR. PRIMIS: I think a break for the court reporter and myself would actually be good for five or 10 minutes, your Honor, if we may.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Okay. All right.

MR. PRIMIS: 10 minutes?
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: 10 minutes.
MR. PRIMIS: Thank you.
THE REPORTING GROUP
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acres irrigated. It may have been the U.S. Department of Agriculture that was contracted to do that, but the U.S. Geological Survey did the thing that I think that was most important to the three states. And that was put together a groundwater model of the Floridan Aquifer in southwest Georgia, southeast Alabama, and north part of Florida, and the ACF basis.
Q. What was the USGS model intended to do?
A. It was intended to determine the -- or to predict how groundwater would react to different inputs of water use. And most of the water use was by agriculture in southwest Georgia. Some was by Florida. Some was by Alabama. But to be able to predict the extent to which water use could affect stream flows in the surface streams of southwest Georgia.
Q. Mr. Reheis, what, if anything, did the results of that USGS study show with respect to the effect of pumping for agriculture on the Flint River?
A. I don't remember exactly how the USGS study showed impacts on the Flint River. But what we ended up doing or the Corps of Engineers ended up doing, working with the U.S. Geological Survey, was to be able to interface the U.S. Geological THE REPORTING GROUP
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Survey model with the hydrologic model of the streams and rivers that they had produced. And by doing so, we were able to predict when and how much water might be decreased in the surface streams as a result of use in the Floridan Aquifer.
Q. When did that -- when did those results come to your attention, the ones where you interfaced the USGS model with the Army Corps model?
A. I don't remember an exact time, but I'm pretty sure it was in 1997. I don't remember if it was early, middle, or late '97.

I think the U.S. Geological Survey by itself on groundwater was in ' 96.
Q. Now, Mr. Reheis, you were EPD director in Georgia when these results came in. Correct?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Okay. So what was EPD's reaction to the findings of this modeling?
A. EPD was concerned because we -- we saw that impacts on the Flint River were predicted. Some of those impacts looked pretty severe. We didn't believe, as the model said, that occasionally on single days here and there you would see zero streamflow in the Flint River. Nature doesn't THE REPORTING GROUP
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work that way. And that was an aberration of the modeling. But it was -- it was something that was in the modeling. You couldn't deny that it was there.

And so we -- we began determining what we needed to do to have higher confidence in that model. There were several things that we needed to do. We needed to --
Q. So let me pause you there just so we have a question. What did EPD determine to do under your leadership in response to these modeling results that you found concerning?
A. To determine as accurately as we could the actual number of irrigated acres in the lower ACF Basin and Georgia, to determine as accurately as we could how much water the farmers were using and on -- on what schedule.

The USGS model had them using the same amount year-round, as I recall. We know that they use virtually 90 percent or more of their water from April to September. It wasn't modeled that way.

We also knew that -- that USGS was budget limited in putting together the model. And by providing some additional money to them, they could probably make improvements to it. So I THE REPORTING GROUP
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went about getting money into my budget from the General Assembly to do what we call a sound science study, which was to contract with the University of Georgia and others to put in water meters on a statistical sampling of farms so that we could get a good idea of how much water was actually being used, and then also contract with the University of Georgia and others to help us ground-truth the acreage that was actually being irrigated.
Q. What does ground-truth mean?
A. Go out, meet with the farmers, show them maps of -- aerial photographs and so on of their region, identify exactly which fields were theirs, which were being irrigated, and which -and what were their water sources.
Q. Mr. Reheis, did you undertake any educational efforts on conservation at this time?
A. We did, but mostly it was done by University of Georgia, the Cooperative Extension Service, and USDA. They were interested in helping, and they did that.
Q. What did they do?
A. They were able to bring to the farmers' attention throughout southwest Georgia ways to use less THE REPORTING GROUP
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> water, how to change out the earlier, less efficient center pivot irrigation systems, the nozzles, the way they delivered water to the field, to lower pressure methods that would not lose as much water to evaporation, and various other techniques.
> Q. Mr. Reheis, did you do anything to slow the growth of agricultural permitting in the region while you did your sound science study?
> A. Yes, I did. I had a lot of meetings with farmers and opinion leaders in southwest Georgia and with legislators and so on to educate people to the fact that we needed to do things differently than what we had been doing regarding agriculture permitting. And that led to my imposing a permit moratorium on November 30 of 1999. That moratorium stayed in place for more than six years until my successor, Dr. Couch, could complete the Flint River Water Development and Conservation Plan. Our laws allowed the director of EPD to suspend the permitting during the pendency of the plan, so that's what I did.
> Q. Mr. Perry pointed out that you had approved some permits before that that were pending before the moratorium went into place. Do you recall that? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

\section*{A. Yes, I do.}
Q. Can you explain to the Court why you did that.
A. There were about 2500 applications for irrigation that came in in '98 and '99-- 1998 and 1999 to EPD for the -- for southwest Georgia. We took a hard look at them.

And farmers were -- were drilling wells and installing irrigation systems because the drought was bad. And they needed to try to get some relief from that. A number of those farmers actually drilled a well and installed a system. Our number at the time there was 864 of them. The rest of them had not drilled wells or were outside of the area of concern.

So I thought long and hard about whether to issue that backlog of permits, decided that based on a variety of circumstances -- one, farmers had a great deal of difficulty in getting crop loans from banks and other lenders if they didn't have an irrigation permit. The commodity prices were -- were low; and diesel pricers were high. And it was just a hard time for farmers to stay above water. And -- that wasn't said quite right. Keep their heads above water, not go underwater in debt.
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And a number of the farmers had followed the normal EPD procedure, which was to get a letter of concurrence, then drill a well, then get the permit, because the permit had to contain specific information on the well that was -- that was drilled, the size, the depth, what aquifer it was in, and so on.

So a number of them had been going through the process legally anyway. And so all in all, I decided that we would -- we would issue that number of permits, 864.

That decision also was made after the legislature in the 2000 session of the General Assembly passed the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And my belief was that by passage of that Act, we could mitigate the impacts of those additional acres that -- for which I was considering issuing permits.
Q. Mr. Reheis, were you one of the people who pushed for passage of the Flint River Drought Protection Act?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Reheis, you testified about some concerns you had over the agricultural water use data that was being used in the comprehensive study. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. There is a document in your binder at that tab 11. It's Exhibit FX-5.
A. I have it.
Q. And --
A. Is this the June 16, 1999, letter to --
Q. Oh, no, I'm sorry.
A. I'm sorry.
Q. No. This is tab --
A. I'm sorry. I was tab 5, not FX-5. Excuse me.
Q. Tab 11, FX-5.
A. All right. Okay. I have it.
Q. Now, Mr. Perry asked you about the second paragraph, fourth paragraph, whichever -whichever you want to call it, but it was the one that says, I do believe the State will need to put a cap on water depletions.

Do you remember that?
A. He was right. That's the fourth paragraph.
Q. Okay. We have an agreement it was the fourth paragraph.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, sir.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Mr. Reheis, I want to ask you; on the -- midway down on the second page of this document, there's THE REPORTING GROUP
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an allocation formula. And it gave them until December 31, 1998, to get that done. The language was that the Compacts would dissolve if that was not done; but it could -- the date could be extended by agreement among the States.

So there were -- it turned out to be a more difficult thing than we had originally thought it would. There were several extensions to the Compact. But during that time, the States and the federal agencies were in numerous discussions with each other and numerous meetings. And all of them did their own analyses as to what they would like to see.
Q. Mr. Reheis, let me pause there. What was your specific role personally in the Compact negotiations?
A. I led the technical team for Georgia, and I was one of -- one of two alternates for our Governors.
Q. And, Mr. Reheis, did the Compact negotiations go from 1998 to 2003?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. And I just want to make sure we understand the time frame. You had the comprehensive study from the early '90's until, I think you said, about THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

1997?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the Compact picked up in '98 and moved forward to 2003?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, you said that you were doing this sound science study beginning in 1998. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So was it going on at the same time?
A. Yes.
Q. Were the other Compact parties aware that you were conducting the sound science study in Georgia?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, Mr. Struhs was here a few days ago in the same seat you're in. And he testified that during the ACF Compact negotiations, the new data and inputs that you proposed departed from long-established understandings reached during the comprehensive study. But you were there. Do you agree with that statement?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, I don't know what long-standing understandings reached meant to him. There would THE REPORTING GROUP
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have been a component on agricultural water use and one on municipal-industrial water use that came out of the study; but they would have -they would have been done by the independent consultants on whatever information they had. I don't remember how far they looked into the future or if they just -- they just added up all the current water users by each of the states.

But -- and looking at the nature of the interstate water Compacts, I was certainly aware that Compacts can be expected to last for decades. Certainly that's what the ones out west have done. And I assumed that the ACF Compact, assuming we could reach agreement on the -- on an allocation formula, would also last for decades.

And I wanted to make sure that Georgia's expected growth in population and irrigation would be reasonably accommodated by whatever formula was ultimately agreed to. And so I made -- with our staff, we made predictions of municipal and industrial water use. And we made predictions of agricultural needs in the Lower Flint. I think that was that \(\mathbf{9 2 0 , 0 0 0}\) acres or so that was in the April 2003 letter to Struhs and -THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. Mr. Reheis --
A. Those were our prerogatives. We were trying to negotiate good conditions and terms for the State of Georgia. That was our offer that we put on the table.
Q. Mr. Reheis, were you aware of anything in the Compact that spoke to whether the parties were bound by the data from the comprehensive study?
A. Absolutely.
Q. What -- I'm going to ask you, if I can -- I just want to ask you to refer to the document. It's at tab 18 of your binder.
A. Yes.
Q. It's FX-209.
A. I have it.
Q. And it is the ACF Compact. Do you recognize that?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. I would like to refer you to Article 7, subpart (e), which is on the backside of the third page.
A. I have it.
Q. Let's wait for the Special Master --

MR. PRIMIS: Are you there?
Okay.
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A. I do not know that. I -- I would have assumed that there would be a very large public process through the federal register and so on and -- if there had been. And I'm not aware of any of that ever happening.
Q. Mr. Reheis --
A. I don't think this has ever been used anywhere else in America.
Q. I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. What did you say?
A. I said I don't know if this has been used anywhere else in America.
Q. Thank you, sir.

Now, I want to talk about a few of the documents that Mr. Perry walked through with you. Can you turn to tab 6 in the book. It's FX-2.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. There is a letter that you wrote to James Butler on June 1, '99. And Mr. Butler was a member of the Board of Natural Resources. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Why did you write this letter to Mr. Butler?
A. Because he had written a letter to me on May 18 asking me some questions.
Q. And what were you responding to?
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A. He wanted information about water use and agricultural water use in specific in southwest Georgia and the Flint River Basin. And so I attempted to educate him and my entire Board of Natural Resources on those issues because I wanted to make sure they understood the importance of the issues; and \(I\) was also going to need their support and understanding for strong action that \(I\) anticipated needing to take later on that year, which was putting a moratorium on permit issuance.
Q. I just want to make sure it's clear. Did you say you were trying to garner support for something?
A. Yes.
Q. What was that?
A. The support and understanding for the fact that \(I\) was going to have to take a difficult action later on that year, which was the moratorium on Ag permitting.
Q. Now, on page 1 of this letter, Mr. Perry directed you to a section in the middle of the first paragraph that starts, the sections of the laws that require farmers to have permits are the weakest of all of Georgia's environmental laws.

Do you remember that?
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A. Yes.
Q. Why did you write that?
A. At the time that \(I\) wrote it, it was correct. I administered all of Georgia's environmental laws. I had read all of Georgia's environmental laws cover to cover more than once. And I knew what the requirements were. And in that particular instance at that time, it was the weakest of our environmental laws.
Q. Let me --
A. That is no longer the case.
Q. I was going to say, let me pause you there. Did Georgia do anything to improve them?
A. Oh, yes.
Q. What did you do?
A. Well, we -- there were several things done in the -- the sound science study itself didn't improve the law; but it improved our understanding of the -- how farmers use water and how much. But that led us to Flint River Drought Protection Act. And that was a change in the law that was very significant. Following that, it led us to the -- and that -- the Flint River Drought Protection Act was in 2000. Then it led us to the Agriculture Metering Act which was THE REPORTING GROUP
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passed in 2003 by the General Assembly. And that required all existing irrigation systems in the state to be metered and all new systems that got permitted to be metered at the time that the -that they got permitted.

The existing ones were to be metered over a period of six years, and there was a program laid out for the General Assembly to fund that.

In addition to that, there was -- there were amendments to the Flint River Drought Protection Act, I think in 2014, that further tightened up requirements in the -- for agricultural water use in the Flint River.
Q. Mr. Reheis, let me pause you there and just ask you one more question about this document. On the first page it says in the third paragraph, if you're there, EPD was given no new money or personnel with which to operate the permit program. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that a concern of yours at the time?
A. It was. We were scrambling to try to get more money and more people into that area for staffing that we knew we needed. And we had also raised some money through the General Assembly to begin THE REPORTING GROUP
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the sound science study.
Q. Did you get additional money for more personnel?
A. Yes, we did. In fact, over the next several years, I guess through 2003, we got something in excess of \(\$ 4\) million for the sound science study and for personnel. And EPD has gotten more than that since and operates a program out of Tifton, Georgia, for Ag permitting. I think they have eight or 10 people assigned to it.
Q. Mr. Reheis, I want to shift gears now and ask you just a few questions about the case filed in Washington, D.C., by Southeastern Federal Power customers against the Army Corps, which we have already heard some testimony about. So I don't intend to cover it in detail, but I do want to just quickly ask you a few questions.

Are you aware that Georgia moved to intervene in that case?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you also aware that Georgia participated in a mediation?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Did you ever hear whether there were any guidelines or restrictions put on the parties to that mediation?
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A. The mediator required the parties to the mediation to -- to not discuss it outside of those parties.
Q. And, Mr. Reheis --
A. And hold the proceedings in confidence.
Q. Mr. Reheis, are you -- do you have any understanding of whether Georgia's participation in moving to intervene in the D.C. case was a secret to Florida?

```
A. No, it was not. We notified Florida and Alabama both that we intended to intervene. And they had the same opportunity to intervene that we had.
Q. Now, Mr. Reheis, I want to talk a bit more about the ACF Compact and how those negotiations ended. Mr. Struhs was left with the distinct impression that Georgia's bad faith caused those negotiations to end. Is that your recollection?
A. No. Georgia never operated in bad faith on the Compact negotiations at any time. And Georgia -none of Georgia's actions were -- resulted in the Compact dissolving. The Compact dissolved because Florida walked away from it.

In July of --
Q. Hang on. Let me pause you there.
A. Sorry.
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Q. I want to walk you through this. Before I do that, do you have a sense of what kind of investment Georgia made in trying to make that Compact negotiation work?
A. Do you start with -- with a comprehensive study?
Q. Sure.
A. Money put into the comprehensive study and into the Compact negotiations was easily more than \$10 million on Georgia's part. And we invested tens of thousands of work hours over a 12, 13-year period in the comprehensive study and the negotiations for the Compact.
Q. Mr. Reheis, you indicated that it was your view that Florida walked away from the Compact. And I want to ask you why you have that view.
A. In July of 2003 the -- there was a Compact meeting. All three governors were there, Governor Riley for Alabama, Governor Bush for Florida, Governor Perdue for Georgia. And I think all of their alternates were there. And there was a discussion and a conclusion that we had a number of agreements in principle for how to develop and finalize an allocation formula. Again, that was some date in July.

Georgia was pretty optimistic after we had THE REPORTING GROUP
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gotten to those agreements in principle, and I assume Alabama was. But about a month later, we received a surprise from Florida. Sometime late in the evening of August 26, 2003, Florida conveyed an allocation formula document to Georgia and Alabama and said, this is it, and represented it as a take it or leave it document.

The Compact was due to end if not extended on August 31 of 2003. And --
Q. Mr. Reheis, what was Georgia's reaction to that?
A. Well, our reaction was that there were several things in the Compact that were the formula -the draft formula that Florida gave us that we had never seen or considered before, never heard before. And we were glad to continue negotiations and discuss those and try to get to agreement with Florida and Alabama, but it was clearly going to take more time.

So our governor, Governor Perdue, along with Governor Riley, who had a similar reaction, said, well, there's things here we can't ever -- we haven't ever discussed. We can't agree to this like it is, but we're glad to keep talking.

And both Perdue and Riley sent, to my recollection, a signed extension agreement to THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Yes.
Q. And, sir, do you see there a letter to the Honorable Lindsey Thomas from U.S. EPA and U.S. Fish and Wildlife?
A. I do.
Q. That's the letter that Mr. Primis asked you about. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I invite your attention to the second paragraph of the letter. And in particular, the last sentence of that second paragraph which reads, quote, 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 of the riverine ecosystems, unquote. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And we talked a little bit earlier about how the federal agencies had a role in the Compact. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right, sir. So I would also invite your attention to the first line of the first paragraph of the letter which reads, quote, in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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response to your memorandum of October 14, 1999, we -- this is EPA and U.S. Fish and Wildlife -are providing the enclosed final version of the instream flow guidelines for the ACT and ACF Basins' interstate water allocation formula, unquote. Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know, don't you, that the commissioner, Mr. Thomas, had to review any allocation agreement among the States. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, if I could invite your attention to paragraph -- to tab 2 in your book, please, and in particular, to page 22. And, sir, this is Joint Exhibit 21, what we were calling the 2006 plan titled Flint River Basin Regional Water Development and Conservation Plan. Are you with me?
A. Page 22.
Q. All right. Thank you, sir.

Now, Mr. Primis asked you a few questions about your sound science study. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that culminated in this particular document
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issued by the State of Georgia. Correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. All right. So, again, let me, if I could, focus on page 22 and item 3 where it reads in the third sentence of that item, these data provide the clearest evidence that agricultural irrigation compounds the effect of climatic drought on streamflow in the basin.

Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. You're not testifying that's incorrect here; are you?
A. No.
Q. All right. Now, can you turn, please, to tab 3 in your binder. And, sir, I think -- I believe you testified earlier that you worked from time to time with Ms. Carmody at Fish and Wildlife while you were director?
A. Yes. On ACT and ACF business.
Q. Okay. Did -- do you remember any discussion about safe yield in the Flint River Basin with Ms. Carmody or anybody else from U.S. Fish and Wildlife?
A. I don't remember any specific discussions. That term was used more than once in probably a THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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variety of contexts over a period of years.
Q. Yes, sir. So tab 3 is Florida Exhibit 46. It's a letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife from 2006, and it relates to the sound science study which culminated into the -- into tab 2.

So I would invite your attention to page 3 of tab 3, Exhibit -- Florida Exhibit 46, where U.S. Fish and Wildlife writes under Conclusions About Safe Yield, the conclusions do not reflect the information presented in other parts of the draft plan that clearly indicate that some reaches of the Flint River Basin have already been allocated beyond safe yield. Current permits must be re-evaluated if reasonable use and sustainable flows are to be achieved.

Do you see that, sir?
A. I see that.
Q. Now, sustainability is something that you from time to time wrote about when you were director. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you familiar with the Flint River -excuse me. The Flint-Ochlockonee Regional Water Council sustainability standards issued in 2011 and embraced and adopted by EPD?
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A. I read -- I read that council's report; but I don't remember their -- did you say sustainability standards?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. I don't -- I don't remember anything specific about that.
Q. All right. Sir, could you turn with me, please, to tab 13. Now, sir, in 1999 your staff included Mr. Nolton Johnson; is that right?
A. It did.
Q. Mr. Napoleon Caldwell?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. David Hawkins?
A. Yes.
Q. Rob McDowell?
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Steve Whitlock. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did any of those individuals advise you in 1999 or thereabout that there was, quote, a water grab in process or in progress in the Flint River Basin by farmers who were interested in irrigating?
A. They may have.
Q. And what, if any, steps did you take to address THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart that water grab, if that was in process?
A. Well, we already had a hold on issuing permits since mid-1998. We were receiving, but not acting upon, Ag permit requests. And then in November -- on November 30, 1999, I issued a moratorium on issuance of Ag permits that stayed in place for over six years.
Q. Isn't it true, sir, that during that 1999-2000 time period you also issued or approved 864 permits for more than 100,000 more acres?
A. I don't remember how many acres, but I do agree with the \(\mathbf{8 6 4}\) permits.
Q. And, sir, did that -- did that group of permits increase the amount of irrigated acreage or permitted irrigated acreage by 20,30 percent?
A. I have no idea what the percent was.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't remember.
Q. Okay, sir. Now, I believe you testified when Mr. Primis was questioning you that the State of Georgia during the ACF Compact negotiations rejected -- I wrote it down; I think you said rejected the joint comprehensive study that had been ongoing between all the parties, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and the federal government, THE REPORTING GROUP
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since 1992. Is that correct?
A. I don't think so. I think what I said was we rejected the numbers for agricultural water use and municipal and industrial water use that were for Georgia in the comprehensive study.
Q. All right, sir. So --
A. And because we thought we had better information and because I wanted to look into the future rather than simply looking at the current present.
Q. Well, sir, I would invite your attention back to tab 19, please, which is the statement by then Governor Zell Miller on the inaugural session of the ACF Compact. Are you with me, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, back to the second page of that document, which is Florida Exhibit 205, Governor Miller's statement there in the second sentence begins, exercising our political will, the information and technical data developed over seven years, the mutual respect resulting from that work, we can allocate the waters of these major river systems in a manner that is equitable and fair to all concerned.

Do you see that, sir? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. Yes.
Q. That technical data to which the Governor refers is the comprehensive study data; isn't it?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay, sir. I would like to discuss for a moment EPD's Ag permitting unit which you referred to a little bit earlier. You said Tifton. Right?
A. It's currently located in Tifton, as I understand, yes.
Q. Now, sir, isn't it true that the State of Georgia has roughly 20,000 agricultural permits that have been entered and issued to farmers for agricultural irrigation?
A. I do not know.
Q. Okay. And isn't it also true, sir, that there are two to three people in the agricultural permitting unit for EPD that have responsibility for oversight of all those permits?
A. My understanding was they have a staff of eight or 10. So I don't know if it's true or not.
Q. And of those eight or 10 , do you know how many actually focus on oversight of agricultural permitting and --
A. I do not.
Q. I'm sorry, sir -- and in particular whether THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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\hline 735 & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
irrigators are complying with their permits? \\
A. I do not. \\
Q. All right, sir. Are you familiar with variable rate irrigation? \\
A. No. \\
Q. How about irrigation scheduling? \\
A. No. \\
Q. Are you familiar with the extent to which Georgia has used its mobile lab program to improve the efficiency of irrigation units? \\
A. No. \\
Q. All right. All right, sir. We'll come back to that with Georgia's witnesses on those topics. \\
Sir, you spoke for a little while about the ACF Compact. And it was intended to be a one-year Compact in 1998; is that correct? \\
A. No, it wasn't intended to be a one-year Compact. It was -- it gave the states and the federal review one year in which to develop an allocation formula. And then it would dissolve unless the States agreed to extend it. So they extended it. My assumption, as I said, was that it would last for decades. \\
Q. It would last for decades if an allocation formula had been arrived at. Correct? \\
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Q. It was just another agreement to agree; wasn't it? \\
A. I suppose you could characterize it that way. \\
Q. All right, sir. As you sit here, do you recall whether or not after the time frame you discussed in connection with GX-50, Governor Bush sent another letter offering to continue to negotiate? \\
A. No. \\
Q. You don't remember that? \\
A. No. \\
Q. Okay. Now, you mentioned the USGS study earlier, too. And you noted that what you decided to do following the issuance of the USGS study was invoke the sound science program. Right? \\
Sound science? \\
A. Yes. That's one of the things we decided to do. \\
Q. Okay, sir. But the USGS study resulted in 1996 in a conclusion that agricultural use in the Flint River Basin was having an effect and, indeed, substantially a profound effect on the Apalachicola River. Right? \\
A. I don't recall that it said that. \\
Q. All right, sir. Can you turn to tab 31 with me, please. And I invite your attention to page 68, please. \\
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A. Yes. Correct. \\
Q. Now, it was an agreement to agree on an allocation formula among the parties; is that right? \\
A. I think that's essentially correct. \\
Q. Okay. And it was extended year after year after year between 1998 and 2003. Correct? \\
A. That's correct. \\
Q. All right. And at that same time, Georgia had decided not to accept the technical data from the comprehensive study on M \& I and Ag use. Right? \\
A. On M and I and Ag use for ourselves, yes. That's correct. \\
Q. All right. And you testified for a bit of time about -- I think it was GX-50, which Mr. Primis held up. And that, in addition, spoke of a Memorandum of Understanding. Is that right? \\
MR. PERRY: Mr. Walton, could you highlight that section of the GX-50 which is on the screen. \\
It's in the first paragraph. \\
BY MR. PERRY: \\
Q. Now, you know, don't you, that that Memorandum of Understanding had no allocation formula in it; did it? \\
A. No, it didn't. \\
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There we go. \\
So you can see page 68 on your screen -- \\
A. Yes. \\
Q. -- or if it's easier, it's at tab 31 . \\
In the second paragraph there about three sentences up USGS writes, thus stream aquifer flow declines upstream of the Apalachicola will reduce flows entering Lake Seminole and subsequently cause reductions in the flow of the Apalachicola River. \\
Do you see that, sir? \\
A. Hang on just a moment, please. \\
Yes. I see it. \\
Q. Okay, sir. Now, I would like to invite your attention back to tab 3, please. Sir, this is one letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife. Are you privy to letters that U.S. Fish and Wildlife wrote about its concerns in 2008 or 2011? \\
A. I am not, nor have I ever seen this one before this afternoon. \\
Q. Now, you haven't read Director Turner's deposition; have you? \\
A. No. I have not. \\
Q. He's -- he was director until earlier this year; is that correct? \\
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\hline & 739 & & 741 \\
\hline & A. Correct. & 1 & question, sir. I do not know how many total \\
\hline 2 & Q. All right. So -- and you weren't here to witness & 2 & of those permits were issued, only -- only \\
\hline 3 & his videotaped deposition designations; were you? & 3 & the 864 that I did. \\
\hline 4 & A. I did not. & 4 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So you're not \\
\hline 5 & Q. Okay. And you, likewise, were not here for & 5 & able to tell me how many were not granted \\
\hline 6 & Mr. Struhs's testimony about the ACF Compact; & 6 & either? \\
\hline 7 & were you? & 7 & THE WITNESS: How many were -- \\
\hline 8 & A. I was not. & 8 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Were not. \\
\hline 9 & Q. Okay. Thank you very much for your time today. & 9 & THE WITNESS: Were not, no, sir. I -- I \\
\hline 10 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? & 10 & cannot tell you that. I don't know. \\
\hline 11 & MR. PRIMIS: Georgia has no further & 11 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: How much -- \\
\hline 12 & questions. & 12 & how much discretion did the director of the \\
\hline 13 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Reheis -- & 13 & EPD have in declaring a drought? \\
\hline 14 & THE WITNESS: Yes, sir? & 14 & THE WITNESS: I guess there was probably \\
\hline 15 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: -- at this & 15 & a reasonable amount of discretion because the \\
\hline 16 & stage I am the most inexperienced and & 16 & rules -- not rules, the guidelines that we \\
\hline 17 & unqualified person to ask you any questions & 17 & developed while I was director we thought \\
\hline 18 & in the room. At this stage. But -- & 18 & were reasonable at the time. And they dealt \\
\hline 19 & THE WITNESS: I'll bet you're not. & 19 & with streamflow levels, groundwater levels, \\
\hline 20 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: -- how many & 20 & long-term weather projections by the state \\
\hline 21 & permits subject to the November 30, 1999, & 21 & climatologist and by the U.S. Weather \\
\hline 22 & moratorium were later granted? & 22 & Service, and what the trends looked like over \\
\hline 23 & THE WITNESS: I know that I issued 864 & 23 & six months prior in these streamflow -- at \\
\hline 24 & permits. I know that there was a number on & 24 & the streamflow gages and groundwater \\
\hline 25 & \begin{tabular}{l}
the order of 2500 permit applications that we THE REPORTING GROUP \\
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monitoring stations. \\
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\hline & 740 & & 742 \\
\hline 1 & had in-house up until November 30, 1999. Of & 1 & So there was a combination of things \\
\hline 2 & those I issued 864. All the rest were either & 2 & that my staff developed in 2001 that we used. \\
\hline 3 & not -- there were some of those that were out & 3 & Whether that combination of factors was kept \\
\hline 4 & of the Flint River Basin. There's & 4 & the same or changed by -- by my successors, I \\
\hline 5 & counties -- several counties have part in the & 5 & don't know. But certainly they had the \\
\hline 6 & Flint, part in another basin. So some of & 6 & discretion to make changes if they wanted to \\
\hline 7 & those were outside the area. Some were & 7 & do so. \\
\hline 8 & inside the area. & 8 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. \\
\hline 9 & They were all held, along with any other & 9 & Was Georgia's irrigation water use \\
\hline 10 & applications that came into EPD, for the next & 10 & during your tenure sustainable? \\
\hline 11 & six years. So I don't know how many permits & 11 & THE WITNESS: If you are talking about \\
\hline 12 & might have been issued after the 864 that I & 12 & just the Flint River Basin, or are you \\
\hline 13 & issued. & 13 & talking about the entire state, sir? \\
\hline 14 & Once Director Turner -- excuse me, & 14 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: The entire \\
\hline 15 & Director Couch and her staff completed the & 15 & state. \\
\hline 16 & Flint River Water Development Conservation & 16 & THE WITNESS: The entire state. I think \\
\hline 17 & Plan, permitting did open back up with some & 17 & in the majority of the state, our irrigation \\
\hline 18 & restrictions. There were areas that were & 18 & use was sustainable. \\
\hline 19 & considered to be very sensitive in which & 19 & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: How about the \\
\hline 20 & there was little or no permitting and other & 20 & Flint River Basin? \\
\hline 21 & areas where the work of the sound science & 21 & THE WITNESS: In the Flint River, there \\
\hline 22 & study, the Water Development Conservation & 22 & were certainly questions. We had those \\
\hline 23 & Plan, showed that permits could be issued & 23 & questions ourselves, and we were trying to \\
\hline 24 & without -- without concern. & 24 & get them answered. \\
\hline 25 & So I don't know the answer to your THE REPORTING GROUP & 25 & And the concern over the fact that it THE REPORTING GROUP \\
\hline & Mason \& Lockhart & & Mason \& Lockhart \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Q. And during your entire career, you served as an oyster biologist for the state?
A. Among other things, yes.
Q. Among other things. One of the other things that was part of your responsibility was to conduct annual oyster resource surveys?
A. That's correct.
Q. And those ended up being documented in reports -official reports of the State of Florida called Oyster Resource Assessment Reports; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it also accurate, sir, that you were actively engaged in all aspects involved in these reports, the data collection, the analysis, and the reporting for these?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you supervised the survey program for more than 30 years. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And, in fact, I think in your direct testimony you said that you're not aware of anyone else who has had more personal involvement with the state's oyster resource assessments than yourself?
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A. That's my opinion.
Q. Now, I want to make sure, because they're very important reports for the Court to understand, that we go through exactly how they're put together and are used. We'll do that in some detail. But in the big picture sense, these reports are used to assess the status generally of the oyster population in the bay?
A. They are used to assess the population, yes, and to use that assessment as a predictive index for harvesting, landing, those type of parameters.
Q. And the department that you were in is the Florida Department of Aquaculture and Consumer Services -- Agriculture and Consumer Services?
A. Agriculture and Consumer Services.

MR. ECHOLS: And for your Honor's purposes, sometimes this is referred to as --

BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. If this is okay with you, Mr. Berrigan.
MR. ECHOLS: -- FDACS or as DACS.

BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Is that the way it's been referred to?
A. Fine with me.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Would you move the microphone.

THE WITNESS: Closer?
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, please.
Thank you.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. So as part of your DACS responsibilities, you would do these oyster resource assessment reports. And then that information would be provided to another department, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's the Florida Fish and Wildlife

Commission, oftentimes referred to as FWC, they're the ones that made the determinations about when the bay would be open to harvesting or when it would be closed to harvesting, at least with respect to being based on the population assessment?
A. The population assessment was used to extend the number of harvesting days during the winter harvesting season. That meant that if a certain number was reached in our population index, then harvesting would be allowed on two additional days after November 15, I think, for that winter harvesting season. And that's the only time that that data would be used to set harvesting THE REPORTING GROUP
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seasons.
Q. I might have asked that poorly, but the resource assessment reports were a resource management tool that FWC used in assessing the harvesting periods and limits for the oyster fishery. Correct?
A. No, I don't think that that is correct. I don't think that they used those in determining their bag limits, size limits, or seasons.
Q. Well, let me phrase it differently. The resource assessments are used to determine if the oyster reach in Apalachicola Bay are capable of sustaining commercial harvest. Would you agree with that?
A. That's correct.
Q. And they are a resource management tool; you would agree with that?
A. They could be used as a resource management tool.
Q. And as you said, they -- the information was utilized to make management decisions for the fishery. Is that accurate?
A. In the case that \(I\) described, that's the only management decision that \(I\) can think of where it is used. And that was codified in the oyster fisheries rule by FWC. THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. I just want to make sure that this is clear for the Court. You're saying that the only resource management purpose for which your reports are used was to extend harvesting days; they weren't used for anything else? \\
A. Let me -- let me be clear. FWC is responsible for fisheries management. That's one type of management. Those -- that index was used to extend the number of harvesting days during the winter harvesting season as codified in their oyster rule. Other management decisions could be based on these data based on, let's say, relative parameters over a period of time. \\
The one management issue that we often used this data for was to determine when populations were low to such an extent that it might require additional actions as far as management was concerned. And those would be used to verify or confirm that there had been some type of depletion event and to try and use those numbers to request additional money to deal with that. \\
Q. Just so it's clear for the Court, now, there was as oyster fishery collapse in 2012 to 2013. Correct? \\
A. There was an ongoing oyster depletion event that THE REPORTING GROUP
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Q. And you took that responsibility very seriously? \\
A. Yes, I did. \\
Q. You wouldn't make things up, put inaccurate information in there? \\
A. That's correct. \\
Q. And you knew that these were official state documents that were going to be part of the state's records for all time immemorial? \\
A. I knew that they would be reports that would be part of the public record. \\
Q. You didn't think that they were important reports? \\
A. I thought that they were important in certain ways. They weren't all as important as this one turned out to be. And I certainly, when I wrote this one, did not feel that it was significantly different than reports that I had previously done. \\
Q. Okay. Well, I think it's important then that we just go for that. We want to make clear for the Court exactly what you put in this report, the information that the Governor sent to the Department of Commerce. \\
MR. ECHOLS: Can we have Joint Exhibit 77, please. \\
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extended from 2010 through my tenure into 2013. \\
Q. That's correct. And the Governor of the State of Florida wrote to the federal government Department of Commerce requesting a federal fishery disaster declaration. You're aware of that? \\
A. I'm aware of that. \\
Q. And you're aware also, are you not, that one of the bases for that request was the August 2012 oyster resource assessment report that you wrote? \\
A. That's correct. \\
Q. And that report was used as one of the pieces of information that the Governor provided to the Department of Commerce to explain why they said Florida needed assistance for the fishery collapse? \\
A. That's correct. \\
Q. Now, these reports -- and I'm going to put this up because this is a very, very important document for this case, this request by the Governor attaching your report that went to commerce. When you did these DACS oyster resource assessment reports, you intended for them to be accurate, didn't you, sir? \\
A. As accurate as we could get them, sir. THE REPORTING GROUP
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
BY MR. ECHOLS: \\
Q. And that's tab 1 in your binder there, Mr. Berrigan. \\
MR. ECHOLS: And, your Honor, you have got it right behind tab 1. \\
A. I see it. \\
Q. And if you would, sir, take a look, if you could. And could you identify, please, that this is a September 6, 2012, letter from Governor Rick Scott, the Governor of Florida, to the acting secretary of the Department of Commerce, Ms. Rebecca Blank? \\
A. Yes, I have seen that. \\
Q. And you have seen this document before? You recognize that? \\
A. Yes. \\
MR. ECHOLS: And let's look, if we could, please, Mr. Smith at the first paragraph of that letter. \\
Is that the first one? \\
Actually, if we could go up one. \\
BY MR. ECHOLS: \\
Q. So you see, sir, in the first paragraph of this letter the Governor is writing to the acting Secretary of Commerce and says, on behalf of THE REPORTING GROUP \\
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\hline Richard [2] - 639:11, & 636:17, 636:22, & 658:6, 693:23, & scheduling [1] - 735:6 & 658:11, 661:1, \\
\hline 639:13 & 637:17, 637:18, & 694:3, 707:15 & scholarly [1] - 559:16 & 661:2, 669:15 \\
\hline Rick [1] - 758:10 & 640:22, 641:19, & 727:20 & science [15] - 616:4, & 671:11, 681:6, \\
\hline rig [1] - 744:9 & 645:12, 646:6, & room [1] - 739:18 & 698:3, 699:9, 708:7, & 702:13, 702:25, \\
\hline right-hand [4] - & 650:23, 650:25, & roots [1] - 743:18 & 708:12, 711:11, & 703:25, 725:11, \\
\hline 520:17, 548:11, & 653:20, 653:25, & rough [1] - 679:22 & 711:14, 717:17, & \(727: 9,727: 11\),
\(733: 16,733 \cdot 18\), \\
\hline \(576: 24,580: 4\)
rights [7]-568:17 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 654: 6,654: 22, \\
& 656: 6,656: 23,
\end{aligned}
\] & roughly [6]-581:5,
\(605 \cdot 17,668 \cdot 7\) & 719:1, 719:5, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 733:16, 733:18, } \\
& 738: 5,763: 1,773: 21
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
650: 15,651: 3
\] & 670:15, 674:24, & 669:11, 679:25, & 737:14, 737:15, & secondly [1] - 511:17 \\
\hline 651:5, 651:7, 651:25 & 675:18, 675:19, & 734:11 & 40:21 & secret [1] - 720:9 \\
\hline Riley [9] - 721:18,
\[
722: 20.722: 24 .
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 675:21, 676:24, } \\
& \text { 677:9, 677:10, }
\end{aligned}
\] & round [1] - 697:19 & scientific [2]-559:18, \(560 \cdot 5\) & Secretary [4] - 535:4, 746:6, 746:7, 758:25 \\
\hline 723:20, 723:23, & 677:12, 677:16, & rudimentary \({ }_{[2]}\) & scientifically [2] - & secretary [1] - 758:11 \\
\hline 724:8, 724:17, & 680:8, 680:23, & 688:25, 705:4 & 522:24, 554:20 & section [33]-512:7, \\
\hline 725:2, 725:10 & 681:25, 684:16, & rule [3]-518:2 & scientist [2]-557:25, & 554:13, 554:14, \\
\hline risk [4] - 744:24, & 684:18, 684:23, & 754:25, 755:11 & 559:15 & 554:21, 555:6, \\
\hline 768:6, 768:7, 769:5 & 685:16, 686:1, & rules [6]-657:15, & scope [1] - 587:4 & 563:16, 563:20, \\
\hline risks [2] - 687:14, & 688:12, 688:14, & 669:23, 741:16 & scopes [2] - 694:7, & 577:20, 585:13, \\
\hline 688:11 & 688:18, 689:12, & 768:18, 771:16 & 694:13 & 586:9, 587:15, \\
\hline river [43] - 512:7, & 689:18, 689:21,
689:25, 695:20, & \[
\text { run }[7]-509: 6,529: 6,
\] & Scott [1] - 758:10 & 588:13, 589:16, \\
\hline 517:5, 518:11, & 689:25, 695:20, & 548:9, 582:19, & scouring [1] - 594:16 & 589:18, 590:11, \\
\hline 519:2, 525:12, & 695:22, 696:2 & 592:12, 631:10, & scrambling [1] - & 598:24, 599:3, \\
\hline 531:18, 532:4, & 701:14, 701:20 & 641:20 & 718:22 & 608:6, 608:7, \\
\hline 537:22, 551:16,
551:21, 554:13, & 716:3, 717:20, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { runs }[3]-550: 16, \\
551: 1,689: 1
\end{gathered}
\] & screen [7] - 539:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 636:17, 639:17, } \\
& \text { 655:6, 656:1, 657:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 554:14, 554:22, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 717: 23,718: 10, \\
& 718: 13,728: 16,
\end{aligned}
\] & rural [1] - 759:20 & 608:9, 711:2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 657: 7,657: 14, \\
& 677 \cdot 3
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 565: 10,565: 20, \\
& 567: 7,573: 11,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 729: 21,730: 12, \\
& 730: 22,731: 21,
\end{aligned}
\] & S & scuttle [1] - 667:16 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 684:12, 711:3, } \\
& 716: 21,736: 19,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 573:19, 584:23, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 737: 19,737: 21 \\
& 738: 10,740: 4,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { safe }[4]-648: 11, \\
676: 15,729: 21 .
\end{gathered}
\] & 667:16 & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
745: 21
\] \\
sections [4]-618
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 585: 10,585: 21, \\
& 585: 24,586: 2,
\end{aligned}
\] & 740:16, 742:12, & \[
730: 13
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
seal [1] - 642:9 \\
season [9] - 54
\end{tabular} & sections [4]-618:11,
633:8, 633:12, \\
\hline 588:16, 590:2, & 742:20, 742:21 & Safe [2] - 618:6, 730 & 637:19, 704:10, & 716:22 \\
\hline 594:3, 594:5, 595:4, & 743:13, 743:15 & salinities [1] - 765:2 & \[
753: 20,753: 24
\] & sediment [3]-585:24, \\
\hline 596:19, 596:22, & 744:12 & salinity [4]-765:14, & \[
755: 10,760: 7
\] & 594:3, 604:18 \\
\hline 597:8, 597:20, & River's [1] - 585:14 & 765:21, 766:4, & 8:1 & see [213]-519:22, \\
\hline 602:20, 604:19, & riverbed [2]-594:25,
604:21 & sampled [1] - 569: & seasonal [2] - 673:5, & 520:23, 520:24, \\
\hline 609:10, 651:21,
651:23, 661:7, & riverine [9] - 546:19, & samples [1] - 595:6 & 1:22 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 522: 18,522: 23, \\
& 531: 24,533: 13,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 733:22, 765:5, & 587:17, 588:1, & sampling [4] - 595:10 & nality [1] & 534:13, 535:25, \\
\hline 765:11 & 591:9, 592:18 & 698:5, 704:17, 763:3 &  & 536:4, 536:12, \\
\hline River [108]-517:6,
518:4, 519:10, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 608: 22,609: 16, \\
& 671: 16,727: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
sand [4]-566:6, \\
594:5,598:25,599:6
\end{tabular} & \[
754: 9,768: 21
\] & 536:13, 536:23, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 518: 4, \\
& 519: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & rivers [10] - 565:25 & 594:5, 598:25, 599:6
saw [5] - 556:3, & seat [1] - 708:16 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 536:24, 537:6, } \\
& 537: 12,537: 13,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
522: 5,524: 8,525: 9,
\] & 569:5, 596:23, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{s a w}[5]-550.3, \\
& 556: 12,643: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & ated [2] - 612:9, & 537:25, 538:1, \\
\hline 525:11, 530:10, & 596:24, 606:18 & 696:20, 725:19 & & 539:9, 542:20, \\
\hline 536:20, 537:8, & 662:20, 665:1, & scan [1] - 594:23 & & 542:21, 543:15, \\
\hline 553:20, 560:2, & 665:13, 673:8, \(696:\) & scared [2] - 666:10, &  & 548:4, 548:5, \\
\hline 568:5, 582:4, & Rivers [1] - 600:10 & 67:15 & 0:24, 542:17 & 562:16, 566:22, \\
\hline 584:22, 587:10, & RMR [2] - 507:14, & scenario [10]-528:8, & \[
3: 2,555: 25
\] & 568:12, 573:11, \\
\hline 588:24, 588:25, & 775:15 & 40:8, 540:14, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 5: 2,55:<0, \\
& 7: 21,567: 2,
\end{aligned}
\] & 573:25, 574:3, \\
\hline 589:8, 589:9, & rob [3] - 625:20 & 49:6, 567:5, 576:1, & \[
30: 18,581: 6,
\] & 574:6, 574:11, \\
\hline 593:19, 596:21, & 625:22, 731:15 & 576:10, 576:11 & \[
2: 18,591: 17
\] & 574:13, 577:23, \\
\hline 597:2, 597:17, & Rob [1] - 510:4 & \[
591: 7,591: 14
\] & 5:2, 625:16, & 578:9, 578:16, \\
\hline 614:16, 615:22, & Robert [1] - 694:2 & scenarios [8] - & 26:5, 626:6, & 578:18, 579:7, \\
\hline 617:10, 619:4, & robust [2]-570:18, & 514:19, 529:22 & 26:14, 626:16, & 579:9, 580:3, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 620:18, 621:10, } \\
& \text { 626:2, 629:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
571:14 \\
role [10]-517:
\end{tabular} & 540:16, 556:18, & \[
626: 18,628: 5,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 582:16, 584:19, } \\
& \text { 587:8, 589:17, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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