
A. Yes.
Q. All right. I would like to read that and ask you, again, a couple of questions. It says, more detailed sampling and analyses confirmed the condition of oyster resources and suggested that the poor condition was the result of a combination of environmental factors and fishery practices.

We touched on this briefly yesterday; but in the category of fishery practices -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- I believe you stated that one set of fishery practices might involve the oystermen, when they're harvesting oysters, if they don't cull and take off the smaller oysters and throw them back into the bay. Is that correct; that would be one fishery practice?
A. Culling would be a fisheries practice.
Q. And could you -- rather than it be in my words, could you explain to the Court what culling is?
A. Typically oysters are harvested in Apalachicola Bay using hand tongs, which are rakes with opposable heads. And the action of those rakes is scissor-like. And the oystermen hold these long-handled tongs; and they work them in such a THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
fashion that they scoop oysters together and then pick them out of the water. And they place the oysters that come out of the -- out of the tongs onto a culling board, as it's called. The rake heads are such that they do allow some small shell fragments and small oysters to fall through; but typically they will include juvenile oysters, marketable oysters, and shell. When that's placed on the culling board, then either the tonger or typically -- or more typically there will be another helper on board, another crew member that will go through this material and take out the legal-size oysters, place them into bags or baskets or whatever their container unit would be. And the remainder of the material is pushed back into the water. So the entire practice is considered to be culling, is the local term for it.

MR. ECHOLS: And I apologize at the beginning, your Honor. We're in tab 1 of that binder. I didn't know if you have your binder still from yesterday.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, counselor.

MR. ECHOLS: Okay. And tab 1 will be THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the -- after the letter from the Governor; and then the letter from Commissioner Putnam is the August report.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
MR. ECHOLS: Okay. And I'm still just reading from the third page there under the executive summary.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And, Mr. Berrigan, then that was one of the fishery practices that you identified. What else did you intend to have included in this category of fishery practices appear in the second to last sentence of the first paragraph there?
A. I believe that the culling is the primary practice that I would have been talking about.
Q. And, sir, how would culling cause the poor condition of the oyster resources as set forth in the sentence there?
A. I don't -- in my opinion culling had little to do with the condition of the resources in the bay. I don't say that anywhere that there's -- that culling was a contributing factor.
Q. Well, I just want to make sure that we're clear. We just went through that -- the sampling and analyses that you performed confirmed the THE REPORTING GROUP
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condition and suggested that the poor condition was the result of a combination of environmental factors and fishery practices. So the poor condition was the result of, in part, fishery practices, which you defined as culling -improper culling. Correct?
A. Yes. And I -- and I see the point that you're making there. The -- in certain circumstances and in -- and this will be important, I think, throughout this discussion as to what the context of this should be or will be in my words.

We can look at the depletion event as a bay-wide event, in which case the environmental conditions affected the oysters bay-wide. If we look at the isolated events on Cat Point and East Hole exclusively, then we could say that harvesting had an impact. That impact, as I have mentioned in this report and others, was more severe and intense because we were dealing with an already stressed resource. Therefore, with the stressed resource, culling practices would have an impact, certainly, but not at a level that affected the depletion event throughout the bay.

So I have to qualify my statements in that THE REPORTING GROUP
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fisheries practices affected two of the oyster bars in Apalachicola Bay primarily. The others were not affected by harvesting or culling.
Q. And it is correct, is it not, sir, that Cat Point and East Hole were the primary producing reefs in Apalachicola Bay?
A. They have historically been the primary producing reefs in Apalachicola Bay.
Q. Meaning that those are the reefs from which most of the oysters that are harvested or a large portion of the oysters that are harvested come from that the oystermen then bring to the dock and sell?
A. Under favorable circumstances, that's correct.
Q. And so your testimony is that with respect to those two primary producing reefs, those, as you write here in this August 2012 report which went to the federal government sent by the Governor -those were harmed by poor harvesting practices?
A. In 2012.
Q. Very good.

If we could turn a couple more pages in, please, to page 3 of your August 2012 report. And if you wouldn't mind, please, looking at the second to the last paragraph, which begins Cat THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Point and East Hole Bar.
A. I see it.
Q. All right. And as with the first page, let me read you a couple of sentences and ask you a couple of questions. It says, starting off here, Cat Point and East Hole Bar have been subject to a combination of factors that have adversely affected oyster populations, oyster reef habitat, and the oyster fishery. Oyster populations over much of the reef area are depleted and the quality of the substrate is degraded to a point where spat settlement and recruitment have been disrupted.

Once again, I'm going to ask for your help in instructing us and the Court as far as what some of these terms are. So in the first instance where it states, the quality of the substrate is degraded, could you please explain what substrate is and what it means for it to be degraded.
A. Oyster bars or functional oyster reefs are made up of living and dead oysters. The dead oysters over time build up what we typically refer to as substrate. And that substrate, over another period of time, a longer period of time, is going to build up some elevation as a feature that we THE REPORTING GROUP
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can identify as a reef.
A functional oyster reef will have, I said,
living oysters of all life stages and dead shell, and a firmness, a consolidated elevation that all in all is considered a substrate.

I don't know if that was very clear, but --
Q. And then, again, to help us out here, where it states that -- I lost my place here -- spat settlement, where it states that spat settlement and recruitment have been disrupted, would you please explain that?
A. What was the question again? I'm sorry.
Q. If you wouldn't mind, we're in the same --
A. Paragraph?
Q. -- sentence there where it says -- after the quality of substrate is degraded, it says it's degraded to a point where spat settlement and recruitment have been disrupted. Could you explain what that means.
A. Yes. For the most part, oyster populations in Apalachicola Bay are dependent upon substrate to -- for larval recruitment. In the broadest and most basic terms that $I$ can use now, oysters, both males and the females, extrude their gametes into the water column where the gametes -- the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
male and female gametes are fertilized. And larvae -- the fertilized egg develops through various stages that we'll just call larval stages until they get to the stage where they're ready to settle out. Typically these larval stages will settle on almost any suitable surface, but the most suitable surface is typically the shell of living or dead oysters.

The settling of this -- of these larvae into a sessile stage is called spat. And the typical reference there is spat fall. When the larvae set on the existing shell or substrate, the terminology is spat fall.

So we speak of successful spat fall, we're talking about successful reproduction and setting. When we talk about recruitment -- when I talk about recruitment, I'm generally talking about the spat that has grown to, let's say, from the size of a microscopic size practically to the size of a fingernail or something like that. That would become a spat that we could recognize and count.

So when we see high numbers of spat, then we're talking about successful recruitment. If we don't see spat on these reefs or on these THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
shells, then we talk about recruitment failure.
Q. So in a layman's terms, is spat a baby oyster?
A. Yes. We can call them a baby oyster.
Q. Okay. You mentioned sessile. Just so we're all understanding the term, when they become sessile -- S E S S I L E?
A. Yes.
Q. -- what does that mean, please?
A. The -- throughout the early life stages or the larval stages, the larvae are free swimming. So they're moving in the water column in and out of areas. They're primarily guided by salinity gradients, wind and wave action, and prevailing water currents. When they set, the trochophore larvae will bounce around the bottom trying to find a suitable habitat.

Their success rate is probably not that good. It's a big bay, and there's not a whole lot of places they're going to find that are really favorable to survival. But once they attach, they cement themselves to that substrate. And from that point on, they're sessile. So they can no longer move away or -- or seek a more favorable place to live. They're there for the duration of their life.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. If we could do down to the next sentence in that same paragraph, there is one other thing that I wanted to ask your help to understand. The sentence says, stress associated with prolonged high salinity, high natural mortality and predation, and intensive fishing effort have markedly reduced standing stocks of juvenile, sub-adult, and adult oysters.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And we have already talked about that there was high salinity, predation, and you defined intensive fishing effort; but I don't think we discussed what are standing stocks?
A. Standing stock is a term that's used in almost all population studies. And that is the -- the living stocks that are there. It could be standing stocks of fish or shrimp or whatever. But in this case, it's the living oysters that are on the reefs.
Q. And is it -- when here you refer to them as being markedly reduced, one way that they could be markedly reduced would be if they are not there, if they have been removed; correct -- the living oyster? That would be low standing stocks?
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A. If they are removed, it would lower the standing stock, yes.
Q. I want to turn back a few more pages to page 7 of the August 2012 report, please. And in particular, in the middle of the page there's a heading that says Harvesting Pressure.
A. Yes.
Q. And if we look here -- let me start at the first sentence. It says, declining oyster population parameters can be associated with harvesting, as well as environmental influences and natural mortality.

And then it goes on, reported oyster landings for Franklin County in 2011 increased marginally over 2010 in both production and bags per trip; but harvesting pressure, as measured in reported trips, increased by about 20 percent.

We talked about the environmental influences and the natural mortality; but is it true, as you state here in this report, that one potential cause of declining oyster population parameters can be harvesting?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think we touched on yesterday that there was an increase in reported trips -- I believe we THE REPORTING GROUP
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touched on it; maybe we didn't -- by about 20 percent, meaning that there are more oystermen in boats going out into the bay to harvest during this period of time?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let me continue to the next sentence there. It says, oyster population parameters for Cat Point Bar and East Hole Bar suggest that oyster abundances and potential production is markedly depressed, possibly reflecting the effects of continuous harvesting, poor harvesting practices, as well as less than optimal environmental conditions in 2010 and 2011.

We talked about already the poor harvesting practices. Now, what, sir, is continuous harvesting? What do you mean there?
A. In the case of Cat Point and East Hole Bar, there had been certain accommodations made, I would say. The term probably might not be correct there, but there were circumstances where harvesting on those bars was extended beyond the normal winter harvesting season for those areas.
Q. And does this go back to what we touched on yesterday that with the BP oil spill, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission extended the

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart


Q. And is it not correct that the reason there was a fishery collapse is that there were not sufficient legal-size, market-size oysters to be harvested?
A. That is not the biological case. You -- the case that could be made from a fisheries perspective is that if there are not enough harvestable oysters remaining, then there would be a collapse in the fishery. What I'm talking about for the most part in this report is that there was a major depletion event that occurred because of poor environmental quality. And it had very little to do with harvesting or taking of legal or sub-legal oysters, because that was the end play. The damage and stress was done and was -had progressed to a very dire situation prior to the harvesting of adult oysters.
Q. It's your testimony, sir, then that it makes no difference for the health of the oyster resource if the small juvenile oysters are taken off the reef and not returned, that that has no effect on the health of the oyster reef and the oyster resource?

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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A. In my opinion it does not. Natural mortality is so high and so high even among that class that it has little to do with the vitality and functionality of an oyster population. These oysters, for the most part, live for approximately $\mathbf{1 8}$ to $\mathbf{2 4}$ months. If they are removed when they're 15 months old or removed when they're 24 months old, it really does not have an impact on the functionality of the reef.

What does have a very great impact on the functionality of the reef is the recruitment of spat and small oysters. And they should be the driving factor for the population, not the end of the life of these oysters. It's the beginning that's important.
Q. How about if they're all removed, sir? All the juvenile oysters, sub-legal oysters are removed from the reef?
A. If all of the sub-legal oysters that were going to move into the adult-size classes were removed, there would be a -- the number that we look at for harvestable oysters per meter, per acre, would, of course, drop to a very low level. The value of the crop might drop if the oysters were too small. So there would be some value there; THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
but the -- the overall vitality would not be affected.

We can -- we can put this in terms of allocation, I guess. If you -- if you have a standing stock and you know that that standing stock is going to grow to some size, and you want to harvest it at that size, but you take it before it gets to that size, there's really no difference except that you have taken that same oyster earlier.
Q. How about if we have a situation where, as here, there are very few market-size oysters. Let's say they have all been harvested, and now all the juvenile oysters have been harvested. Does that cause an effect on the health of the reef, or is the reef still healthy in your opinion?
A. The reef is definitely not healthy. If you can harvest all of that product, it's not healthy. This is a renewable situation that is dynamic.

And in Apalachicola Bay, you have to understand that spawning is taking place almost every month of the year. There's recruitment almost every month of the year. There are spawning peaks that we can watch and follow and make -- be able to develop relationships about THE REPORTING GROUP
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what's going to happen on that reef. And by looking at those -- that population as a whole, you're able to establish whether that population is healthy and whether that reef is healthy.

Again, taking the top of that or the end of those oysters is not critical. It's -- those oysters are -- can I elaborate on something?
Q. Well, why don't we -- we can continue on. I'm sure your counsel will have time --
A. Okay.
Q. -- to have you elaborate on some of these.
A. Okay.
Q. Let's try to get through at least this first section before we get to the morning break.
A. Okay.
Q. It is your testimony, sir, that if all the juvenile oysters and all the market-size oysters have been removed, then that would be an unhealthy reef?
A. It's -- that is a very hypothetical situation. I mean, that occurs in massive mortalities, massive depletion events, and what $I$ would call an extension event, which I have seen on reefs. I have seen that many times. But those did not come from harvesting. I have never had the THE REPORTING GROUP
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occasion to see where harvesting was efficient enough to remove all of those oysters.

But to answer your question, if they were all gone, $I$ would say, yes, that reef is in serious ecological trouble.
Q. Okay. Well, let's good. And I'm going to show you some pictures before we finish this first block of that situation where you have harvested reefs where all the oysters have been removed. So we'll get to that, so you can explain that to the Court then.

The next paragraph here says -- this is the paragraph beginning the practice. And it says, the practice of harvesting sub-legal oysters appears to be an extension of a "use it or lose it" attitude that prevailed during the fall and winter of 2010. Following the oil spill in April 2010, there was an acknowledged threat to oyster resources in Apalachicola Bay, and management policies were directed toward harvesting available resources in the face of a growing risk of loss.

That's what you wrote in this official report that was provided to the Governor and provided to the federal government. Correct?
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A. That's correct.
Q. And this is in August 2012. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. It goes on, throughout the period when oil posed an unpredictable threat to the oyster fishery, less effort was directed toward enforcing size limits, perhaps yielding to the view that it would be more beneficial to harvest the available resource. But, unfortunately, many oystermen have continued the same harvesting practices that were allowed during the oil spill threat.

Now, in that first sentence there, sir, it says, less effort was directed toward enforcing size limits.

Now, that's the responsibility of Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. The size limit being 3 inches and the rule being that except for some tolerances, those small and juvenile oysters are not supposed to be taken out of the water?
A. They're not supposed to be.
Q. And here you're saying in August 2012 that even though back when the oil was believed to possibly be coming to the Bay -- and it didn't
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get there -- but still, now, in August 2012 this same harvesting practice is taking place?
A. That's correct.
Q. Next sentence down, you refer here -- this is the paragraph beginning the Division's 2011. And it states, the Division's 2011 oyster resource assessment report for Apalachicola Bay, Division of Aquaculture 2011, stated that oyster population estimates indicated that recruitment would keep pace with harvesting pressure and sustain production throughout the 2011/12 winter harvesting season, colon, with the caveat that increased harvesting pressure and/or the unabated harvesting of sub-legal stocks may alter the production/harvesting balance. In 2011, reports of the harvest and sale of oysters below the legal-size limit was still common practice, and it is now clear that there are not sufficient numbers of juvenile and market-size oysters to support harvesting throughout the upcoming season.

That's what you wrote here in August of 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is a warning that you were providing in 2011, it states, that if this increased THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
harvesting pressure or the unabated harvesting of sub-legal stocks continued, there may not be sufficient numbers of juvenile and market-size oysters to support harvesting throughout the upcoming season. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you did -- you did a 2011 report. This was something that you recognized even a year prior to this August 2012 report; isn't that the case?
A. This -- this was a -- something that is pretty easy to recognize when you look at the data and make this interpretation.

What this is stating is that we have a nine-month season. If you harvest all the juveniles or sub-legal ones in the first two or three months of that season, yes, you're going to begin to run out by that -- by the end of that season.
Q. And this is a concern that you raised in 2011, not just in 2012?
A. I have raised that concern almost every year when there's some concern about the number of standing stocks.

And, again, that becomes an allocation issue. Do you want to try to take them all in the first THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Yes.
Q. Does that help you recall that these are among the documents that you were asked to provide and gave to the State of Florida's attorneys that then were produced to us in the course of the litigation?
A. I'm sorry. I didn't follow that completely.
Q. I'll make it simpler. When we asked for -- when Georgia and when we asked to have your deposition, we also asked you to provide documents relating to the topics of this lawsuit. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And some of the lawyers -- I don't recall which one -- from the State of Florida came to you and asked you to give them the documents you had relating to this lawsuit?
A. Okay. Yes. And this was one of those.
Q. And this is one of those, as you can see --
A. Okay.
Q. -- from the bottom right-hand corner where it has your name. That's the way the documents from you were numbered.
A. Okay. I'm not arguing that. I'm just saying I don't recall how this entered into the process. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Q. Oh, sorry.
A. I mean, I understand how it entered into the process that we're in now. I don't know how it entered into the process of writing the report.
Q. Very good. Let's please go down to the paragraph that starts further compounding. And I would like to -- we have talked about the first part. Let's go to the last sentence, please, where it starts exacerbating. Are you with me, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's got, exacerbating this harvesting pressure is a new cultural characteristic of the harvester, wherein fishermen are not only ignoring the size restrictions, but placing everything in the tongs into the bag, resulting in a loss of shell, cultch, and shellstock.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is one of the notes that you put down for yourself at the time as you're preparing to put together the August 2012 official DACS report. Right?
A. Again, I -- I confirm that this is here; but I can't confirm that I put this down before or after the report or whatever. THE REPORTING GROUP
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I mean, typically this is not the way I work.
I usually write the report and then do amending drafts and that type of thing. I typically wouldn't go to this kind of trouble and then write the report.
Q. Okay. But --
A. I'm just confused about how this fits into that process.
Q. Sure. But you don't have any dispute, sir, that you wrote this?
A. No. No. I'm fine with that.
Q. This is your document, and these are your words. Right?
A. Yes. My only concern there was that you said that I made these notes prior to writing the report. These may have come after I wrote the report.

But, yes, I'm not -- I'm not arguing that they're not my notes.
Q. Would you call this process here that you're writing about, the fishermen placing everything in the tongs into the bag, would you call that tonging up trash?
A. Yes. That's the terminology.
Q. I recall that because in your direct testimony THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
that you submitted in the case, there was that reference. And if we could look -- I don't know if you have your direct testimony in front of you, but we'll pull it up on the screen. It's paragraph 59 in your direct testimony.

And we -- I believe that --
MR. ECHOLS: I believe, your Honor, it's on page 17 of the written direct testimony, sir.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And there, sir -- are you there, Mr. Berrigan?
A. Yes.
Q. And there, sir, in paragraph 59 you said in your written direct testimony, similarly, the collapse of the oyster fishery in Apalachicola Bay in 2012 was not as a result of harvesters taking unculled oysters and dead shell off the reefs when harvesting. This practice is commonly called tonging trash. Observations suggest that this practice is uncommon, and only practiced by a small group of unskilled oystermen. This type of harvesting results in a vastly degraded product and is meant to deceive the processor and the consumer. The concern with this harvesting practice is that the oystermen are hauling off THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. Basically each one of these reefs acts as its own little individual ecosystem?
A. I'm trying to think of the right word for that.

I mean, when we talk about ecosystem, we're talking about a little larger thing. But there -- there's -- let's just say that they are isolated ecosystems that -- there is terminology for it; and it's not micro, eco, or macro. But I don't recall what it is.

But your statement is essentially correct.
Q. Okay. Basically -- basically all of these reefs are acting as kind of individual ecosystems based on the conditions of the portion of the bay they're in. Right?
A. As a scientist, I just have a difficult time agreeing with that because they're not isolated as far as reproductive potential. They are dependent upon other reefs for reproduction. The -- their reproduction is not isolated. Once they have spawned into the water column, those larvae may move miles from -- from that reef. So larvae that are spawned on a reef are not necessarily going to set on a reef -- on the same reef. Most likely they won't.
Q. Okay. Sir, do you remember that you and I met THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
before when I took your deposition?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm not trying to be controversial at all, but just to be complete and accurate, if I can refer you to page 148 of your deposition.
A. Okay.
Q. And if you will see in the area of lines 11 to 25, I had asked you a question about what you were noting at this point in time. And you said in part in response there, quote, and we -- I'm starting on line 17. And we early found out that what happens on one reef is not a good representation of what to expect bay-wide or on another reef and things like that. All of these reefs are acting as kind of individual ecosystems based on the conditions of the -- that portion of the bay.

Correct? That was your testimony?
A. That's correct. I don't find a problem with that, except that trying to be more scientific about it, my terminology of individual ecosystems is -- you know, it's very broad there.
Q. Sure. And then -- but you also then would agree it's very difficult to make a statement of one size fits all when you're talking about oysters
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in Apalachicola Bay; would that be accurate?
A. Yes. I agree with the premise that we're dealing with here that one reef is not representative of the other reef -- of another reef.
Q. And also not representative of the bay. Right -a single reef?
A. Not a single reef.
Q. In fact, as you have explained to me, as a matter of fact, it's impossible; and it shouldn't be done. Right?
A. It should not be done.
Q. Yes. I take it you were not involved in working with Florida's experts in connection with their preparing their expert reports?
A. No, I was not.
Q. So to that extent -- to the extent, if it is the case, that Dr. White had a model that based conditions on the bay on a single reef, you would have told him that it's impossible to make a statement of one size fits all and shouldn't be done to reach conclusions about the entire bay from a single reef?

MS. WINE: Your Honor, I object to that again. Again, he's characterizing something that an expert witness said or maybe said, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
his characterization of it, and asking the witness to comment on it.

MR. ECHOLS: Judge, I don't think it's an unfair question for me to -- whether I'm accurate or not, obviously Dr. Wilson will be here. Counsel will have redirect. If I'm shown to be wrong, that's fine. But given that I have got Mr. Berrigan, who has got 30-plus years of experience evaluating the bay, and this is his sworn testimony, I don't think it's an unfair question.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Would you ask the question again, please.

MR. ECHOLS: Sure.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And I can keep it very simple. Would you agree, sir, that in your opinion based on your experience as one of the most knowledgeable people about the bay, that it would be inappropriate and should not be done to draw conclusions about the entire bay based on a single oyster bar?

MS. WINE: Now, he's just asking him a hypothetical. And he's a fact witness, your Honor.

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry?
MS. WINE: I said now he's asking a hypothetical. And he's a fact witness, not an expert witness, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may answer.
A. To the issues that you address there, you will have to repeat to me.

But let me say this before that. I am not a modeler. I really don't do very much modeling. And I know that there are a lot of limitations to modeling, and they're based on available information. So I would never tell anybody don't do this.

And I forget exactly what you said in the middle of that question that $I$-- that $I$ found a little bit objectionable. But $I$ think it was something to the effect that I would never tell somebody to do that or something like that. And I would actually encourage them to do the modeling.

Now, whether or not I would trust their conclusions, if their conclusions were opposed or contradictory to what I have personally observed, I would have a problem with that.
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Q. One thing, as you described when we were looking at the picture of the different types of reef structures, when you first looked at the A picture that looked -- was very healthy, had the elevation, you said it appeared to be a restored reef. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, $I$ said -- what $I$ think $I$ said was this photograph looks like photographs that we have taken of recently restored reefs. We -- I have seen very similar things like this in our work.
Q. And changing to that topic, the restoration of reefs was part of your responsibilities in DACS. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And one of the main ways that this restoration is done is through a process calling shelling or reshelling?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is it also known sometimes as cultching?
A. Yes, it could be called cultching.
Q. And could you describe generally for the Court what does this restoration process of cultching or reshelling -- what does it involve?
A. As I explained earlier in trying to give the basis of the life cycle of oysters, oysters need THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
a clean surface to set on. The act of shelling is putting clean shell on these reefs so that there is a clean surface available for oysters to set on. It's a very common practice and probably the most simple management practice that we can do that has proven to be successful. Very simple, adding habitat, creating habitat that the oysters can use.

Typically this is done in a large scale. Typically we use a barge to deploy the materials. We also collect these oyster shells often from processing plants so that we recycle the shell that's from shucked oysters.

By placing it out there, we are -- we are creating or rehabilitating, the term that we use most, reef structure. And we can deploy that at various levels, depending upon how impaired the reef structure is.
Q. You would agree that it's a -- it's an important resource management tool for maintaining and enhancing productive oyster habitats?
A. It's a -- did you say important?
Q. Important resource.
A. Yes, it is important.
Q. And I think you called it a best management THE REPORTING GROUP
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practice?
A. It's among the best management practices that I have been involved in.
Q. And when we were looking at some of the other pictures and you described how -- the functional reef versus reefs that may not be in that good a shape, would you agree that restoring habitat is an important aspect in restoring reef functionality?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, actually, you did a couple of papers about large-scale reef restorations that were done in Apalachicola Bay back in the mid-' 80 's; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Because, as you mentioned before, you had -- in the ' 85 time period there was Hurricane Elena and, I think, Kate back to back; and it practically decimated the entire oyster population in the bay?
A. That's correct.
Q. And at that point in time, given the decimation of the oyster population, the State took some significant and prompt actions to restore the bay and the reefs. Right?
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Q. All right.
A. But typically when we're putting down cultch material, it's almost always going to be a positive.
Q. Okay. Let's look at another example then. Can you turn back to your binder, tab 8.
A. Are we not going to give an explanation of these pictures?
Q. No. It was just so we could have something in color.

And tab 8 -- behind tab 8 we have got Joint Exhibit 60. Are you there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And this Joint Exhibit 60 you will see at the top says October 2011 Assessment of Minor Bars in the Western End of Apalachicola Bay.

Now, in October 2011, you still were working for DACS; and you were responsible for resource management. Right?
A. October 2011?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Yes.
Q. And here, is this, similarly to the prior report we looked at, one of those assessments that your staff is doing to assess how planted reefs are THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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developing?
A. They -- it looks to me here that they have assessed more than just planted bars.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. That's -- you're absolutely right. I see that at the top here it states that this assessment was undertaken due to reports by the industry and a leaseholder of a large number of dead or dying oysters found in the western end of the bay.

And sometimes it would be the case that oystermen, folks in the industry would come to DACS and say, hey, I see something that doesn't look right. And you would go out to check to find out if there was a problem or not?
A. That's correct.
Q. Right. Yes, I'm sorry. This wasn't just based on planting.

Can you look then at the overall description there with the paragraph that says Overall.
A. Yes. I see it.
Q. And there it says, and here we are in October 2011. We're still in the drought. Correct?
A. We are -- we are in the process, yes.
Q. Right.
A. We're in the progression of this thing.
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Q. And here it says in this assessment of these bars on the western end of Apalachicola Bay, with the exception of Scorpion Reef, all areas exhibited new growth, a good spat set, overall good health and high numbers of live oysters. The appearance of the oyster meat and texture is improving. They are becoming fatter and healthier as the temperatures cool.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. That's all positive. Right?
A. Those are positives.
Q. And then we go on. It says, the minimal fresh mortality observed was the result of predation by the oyster drill. During drought conditions, the oyster drill is able to embed within these reef complexes and can have a significant impact on the health of the oyster reef.

And that's correct, too. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you testified yesterday, when there's drought, when it's drier, oyster drills show up in these locations. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then it goes on to say, at present, the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
oyster drill can be found throughout the western portion of the bay system. Mortalities will continue until the river begins to rise.

But at this point here we're already near the end of 2011. It says, the Scorpion Reef area was the only area observed to be in poor condition.

Right?
A. That appears to be what they saw.
Q. And at the last two sentences of that paragraph it says, however, as noted earlier, the other reefs observed were in good condition. There were no significant mortality events occurring in the western end of the bay.

Right?
A. That -- that's a broad statement that they made.
Q. That's a broad positive statement. Right?
A. If it were correct, I would say it was a positive statement.
Q. You figure Mr. Shields and Mr. Gunter got it wrong?
A. No. I'm thinking that their terminology, the western end of the bay, is one thing. Where these leases are is where they're talking about. If they were talking about the southwestern portion of the bay where the mortalities had THE REPORTING GROUP
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begun and where we had already quit sampling by this time because of extensive mortality, that would throw that statement into question.
Q. But here --
A. As for where they're talking about, if they're talking about where they -- where these leases are located is western Apalachicola Bay, I'm agreeable to that.
Q. Okay. If we can turn one page in, please. It's the page that at the top -- and we can ignore the pictures since they're black and white, if we like; but at the very top it says North Spur Plant Site. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What does plant site mean?
A. That would be an area that we had done restoration on.
Q. And can you agree with me, sir, as reflected here in this October 2011 report, in the middle of the drought at the North Spur plant site where you had done restoration, the DACS people working for you were reporting no sign of fresh mortality, good growth, large range of size classes, animals looked healthy, good overall appearance, one fresh box, one drill, and no harvesting occurring THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart at this site.

Do you read that the same way I do?
A. Yes. At that time things were -- were fairly good; and we were encouraged.
Q. I'm sorry. Can we go to the next page there. We have got Little Gully.
A. That's correct.
Q. And so Little Gully, is that another reef?
A. That's a location on Dry Bar Reef.
Q. Oh, it's on Dry Bar. Okay.

And here it says that this is a test -- or, rather, a sampling that was done with the tongs again; is that right?
A. I'm assuming that all of this was done by tongs since there's no quadrat data with it.
Q. And here, again, on Little Gully, which you said is on Dry Bar, is that --
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And here, again, we have got no sign of fresh mortality, and new growth. Animals look healthy, good overall appearance. There are two boxes -- and for the Court's purpose, boxes, those are dead oysters. Right?
A. Recently dead oysters where the shell is still articulated.
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Q. Recently dead oysters. And they're called boxes.

And some -- there's new boxes and old boxes; is that right?
A. I would suppose you could categorize new and old.
Q. And then sometimes is it the case that these things are called gapers? Have you heard that before?
A. Yes, you could use that term. Gapers, typically you're talking about very fresh dead oysters.
Q. Okay. So they're dead oysters.

So we have two dead oysters, fresh boxes, and two drills present; but otherwise, the description here is that -- you would characterize, would you not, that this bar -this portion of the bar is doing quite well?
A. Yes. I -- I think that you have shown that at this time, and they have shown at this time that the bay, in fact, is in good shape and coming back.

That's one of the things that $I$ have represented about this area and the recovery from the Deepwater oil spill. At this time, things were looking pretty good. But the things that I would add to this that need to be qualified is that the southern portions of St. Vincent Sound THE REPORTING GROUP
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where you would expect the highest salinity conditions were already in bad shape. And Scorpion Reef in western St. Vincent Sound where you would expect the most high salinity conditions, those were already in bad shape.

So what we have demonstrated here is, yes, what we were doing out there, it all looked good. At this time things looked like we were in good shape. This was nine months before we started to really recognize that -- the severity of the depletion.
Q. Well, that's not exactly right though; is it, sir?
A. And then a year -- by a year later, these reefs were essentially gone.

Yes, that's my observations of it.
Q. At the time that you wrote the August 2012 resource assessment report --
A. That's right.
Q. -- there were reefs that were doing relatively well; were they not?
A. They were still doing relatively well in July of 2012. By October -- and I went back out there -- when we started to recognize the severity of the situation, there weren't 5
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were talking about the Board of Commissioners meeting that you attended and presented. And I believe everybody has the slides from that now. I just want to ask you about some of the additional things you told the Board of Commissioners and all the members of the Apalachicola oyster community about how the bars were doing relatively, especially comparing those that you had planted versus those that had not been.

MR. ECHOLS: Can we look at slide 5, please.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Okay. In that -- that, again, is you, sir, presenting to the Franklin Board of County Commissioners and the Apalachicola oyster community?
A. Yes.
Q. And here you're noting to -- at the same time, September 2012, when the Governor's request is going for a disaster declaration, that there are areas of the bay that have normal reef structure, normal oyster populations; and these are small -very small areas, and most of those are managed THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
areas that you, DACS, have been planting over the last few years. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And those areas that you planted and reshelled, they survived very well. That's what you told them?
A. They had survived very well to that point.
Q. Yes. To that point, which is September 2012?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then you further go on to say that not only did they survive well, they have normal size frequencies, distribution, spat, juveniles, adults, mortality; everything is normal on the bar that you planted. Right?
A. I will agree with that.
Q. Okay. Let's go and see what else you said.

MR. ECHOLS: Let's go to slide 6, please.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Do you see that, again, here we are talking about on East Hole -- I'm not sure if this is the same portion that we were looking at before; but you're telling everybody that the bars that had been shelled were doing fine. Right?
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A. I don't know the context of this statement. I would have to see what the but, no, meant.
Q. Okay. But actually what had happened in between was some guy interrupted you, and you said you would take questions later. So I took out the interruption.

But, regardless, whatever you're referring to, you're saying there are some bars that are doing fine. Right?
A. Let me read this.

I'm talking about shell. The bars that I'm talking about right now are on East Hole. Some of you who have already been out there fishing know where we're talking about.

I would -- I would take from this excerpt that we're talking about the same planted reef that we have been talking about on East Hole.
Q. Got it.

MR. ECHOLS: Let's go to slide 7, please. You can go ahead and play that.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And that's, again, you presenting to the Franklin Board of Commissioners and the Apalachicola oyster community; and that's what you told them? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## A. Yes.

And you have to understand the context here.
Most of this listening audience are not real receptive to what we have to say. What they want us to say is there was oil in there and there was dispersant in there and there was a mass extinction. What I'm giving them is an explanation of why we know that there was not a mass extinction because there are living, functioning reefs out there at this point.
Q. And, in fact, you tell them that you looked at some of the shell that we planted most recently covered with spat. And that's a good, healthy thing --
A. Yes.
Q. -- right?

All right.
MR. ECHOLS: Let's go to the next slide, please.
(Whereupon the video was played.)
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And that's true also, is it not, that you were identifying to the Franklin County community and the commissioners that there was a difference from some reefs to others; and, in fact, that the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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A. No, I don't. But it sounds like an accurate statement.

I don't know where you are.
Q. I'm at the very, very, very, very bottom.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see it now.
Q. And you said that sounds like an accurate statement. These -- the primary producing bars for the bay, Dry Bar/St. Vincent and Cat Point/East Hole didn't have any substantial cultching in over a decade at this point. Correct?
A. That's -- Cat Point was -- probably was never cultched in $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ years.
Q. Okay. All right. Mr. Berrigan, you would agree with me, would you not, that having gone through these reports for 2011 and 2012, we saw that for two years in a row these official resource assessment reports you had were warning about the high level of harvesting taking place. Correct?
A. It warned that if intensive harvesting occurs, the resource will not sustain harvesting through that winter harvesting period.
Q. And that is precisely what your report said, that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
intensive harvesting was taking place. Correct?
A. It was taking place, and the numbers that you put up there showed it.
Q. And concentrated harvesting and continuous harvesting; is that right?
A. Concentrated and continuous harvesting, it's continuous for nine months --
Q. Yes?
A. -- if the oysters are available.
Q. You do recall your report says continuous harvesting. Right?
A. I -- I'll buy that.

I'm getting --
Q. I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you, sir?
A. I said I will agree with that.

I mean, you have shot me full of a lot of statements here; and I'm not keeping up with every one of them quite as well as you are.

## Go ahead.

Q. Okay. Would you also agree with me that over this two years in a row, your official reports, which were public and made available to FWC, expressed concerns about the sub-legal harvesting taking place?
A. Yes.
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Q. And they further noted that the sub-legal harvesting was not being enforced against. Right?
A. It was my opinion that sub-legal harvesting was going on. I do not know for fact whether or not it was underreported or even occurring.

That was the word on the street. That's what $I$ have been told. That is my opinion that it was occurring. But I was not out there measuring or counting or doing any of those things to prove one way or the other.
Q. And, similarly, we saw in at least four, perhaps five occasions that you were commenting on this "use it or lose it" approach to harvesting oysters. Right?
A. Yes. And I -- and you have to understand what "use it or lose it" means in this context. This -- when you have -- when you're at risk of losing the whole crop, you might as well harvest it. There's no point in trying to salvage it, save it, or do anything like that because natural mortality is going to wipe it out. You might as well get the economic benefit from it.

Leaving it there does not mean that it's going to be available to the fishery at another THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart



going to be the highest.
Where we saw this event begin -- and in several of those reports it talks about even in 2010 we had quit sampling St. Vincent Bar. At one time we had four sampling stations along St. Vincent Bar here. That would have been from the southern end to the northern end.

By 2011, the winter harvesting season, this bar was eliminated from sampling at all. There were no adult oysters that we found in our sampling stations. So we don't sample when there's nothing there. That's not the aim of our sampling was not to determine cause and effects and things like that. Our -- the point of our sampling was to determine where there are oysters and how many are there so we can tell the fishermen essentially where they are. We weren't involved in $\mathbf{2 0}$ years of telling them where they weren't.

The -- this area across here is Dry Bar, which we talked about; North Spur, which is another area that we talked about.

But in -- when the samples were taken in July of 2012 -- and this is a year after the photographs and stuff that we talked about --
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close to a year -- there were pockets in here where oysters were still good, particularly on North Spur which had been recently restored. Green Point, that had been recently restored. These two were the principal areas that we're talking about that had -- there were some on these smaller bars back here were still okay.

So this area right here was still receiving some influence from fresh water.

But when we went back out again in October and November of 2012 and looked at these after we had already predicted that things were going to get worse, the mortality event had now encompassed all the St. Vincent Sound.

Previously we talked about Scorpion and those that were out there that we -- that were -- where it was first noticeable. Now, the entire area was essentially depleted of oysters, including oyster leases that weren't being fished, and specifically this lease, which actually had some freshwater source, was completely depleted. These inner tidal reefs I walked along, there weren't any live oysters on them.

And what we saw and what we observed throughout this movement or progression of this

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
depletion event was a large number of conchs.
And I'm just going to use the word conchs because that's what we use to commonly call that.

By November, the last time that I went out there to look at these, we were doing tong samples. And we came all the way to the jetties.

Now, the Intracoastal Waterway cuts the jetties. It's right there. They're right on the edge of the Intracoastal Waterway. And all of these oysters -- 95 percent of these oysters were now dead. And so that whole thing had progressed that way.

What -- what this really involves then is there's no more fishing out here. People -- the fishing fleet had pretty much moved to this spot at the beginning of the summer harvesting season in 2012; and they essentially stayed there. When they came back out here, there was nothing there. So we have compressed all of the fishing that could have been on all of these bars to right here. This is the area where we're fishing.

And much of the conversation that we have had and discussion that we have had about intensive harvesting was the inevitable consequence of not being able to fish anywhere else. Of course, THE REPORTING GROUP
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they're going to fish these stocks down. That was inevitable.

And we see that and we see the landings up; that's good. The value was extremely high, highest they have ever had. The demand was the highest it's been, because the other states weren't producing.

So, yes, there was extreme harvesting pressure. Did it have a debilitating effect? Yes, it did, on those standing stocks.

But the harvesting pressure in those two years had nothing to do with the mass depletion that took place in this bay and all of this other area. And it is my opinion that high salinity based on benthic ecology that we observed was responsible for the depletion event throughout the bay.
Q. Thank you, sir. Unless the Special Master has something else, you can take your seat again.

And, sir, if you would indulge me with one more piece of this video.

You went on to explain the importance of fresh water after you identified it as the
biggest problem. Again, this is the last clip from the Franklin County Commission meeting in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

action and scour, the shells break up and are
quickly broken up.
When I looked at oysters between the time

period, let's say, of July when the samples were
taken and then went back and looked in late

October and November, the condition of the reef

was essentially the same, except all the oysters

were dead. The oysters, like I said, were

still -- when they were clustered, they were

still there. The clusters were still there. We
saw dead oysters from the size of a thumbnail up
to marketable size. It looked like a functioning
of your prefiled direct, that you believe that overharvesting or intense harvesting on Cat Point and East Hole was a result of the depletion event and not a cause. Is that correct?
A. That's correct. That's what I tried to point out there that this was the inevitable consequence of depletion within the bay starting from the more distant areas from the river, compressing inward, that it not only -- not only compressed the living populations to a smaller isolated area, it compressed the fishing pressure to that area.

And I might add that during this time -- and I probably already said this -- that prices were high. Demand was high. And there were not a lot of other jobs around. So a lot of people were involved in the oyster harvesting.
Q. And, sir, you have said that you don't believe that overharvesting or intense harvesting was a cause of the depletion event. Do you believe that the taking of oysters smaller than 3 inches in size was a cause of the depletion event?
A. No, I don't even see that they're related. I see that one is the result of the depletion event. The depletion event had started and was progressing throughout this period that -- since THE REPORTING GROUP
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fishing was occurring. And it just -- it just became more compressed and more intense on a very isolated oyster population. I did not feel that taking those oysters had anything to do with it.

I mean, it -- what it did was it increased the early harvest of some of those so that the product ran out maybe sooner than it would have had there been some sort of allocation of that -of that crop. But that's just not the way that it is. The fishermen are going to take what's there.
Q. And, sir, you stated earlier that you don't think the taking of an oyster that's less than 3 inches in size has a biological effect on the bay. What did you mean by that?
A. It would -- in some fisheries where you would effectively diminish the larger adults, they might -- it might have some impact on reproductive potential. In oysters, they begin to contribute to the reproductive population at a very early age, some of them probably maybe just a few months old.

Most small oysters are male. Most larger oysters are females. By taking sub-legal oysters, you're not having -- you're not THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
effectively changing the biological reproductive potential.

As a matter of fact, when we reviewed some of these things, we had in the past looked at reducing the size limit. And during that time $I$ wrote position papers indicating that reducing the size limit was not going to have a biological effect or a negative biological effect.

And another thing that we did, we tried -- we also talked about moving the season back so that we could protect the small oysters until they grow. That was not intended to have a biological effect either.

There is no evidence that removing sub-legal oysters has ever had an adverse impact on reproductive potential in Apalachicola Bay. Apalachicola Bay is an extremely productive system. It's not like a lot of other systems, and it's certainly not like systems further north in the Chesapeake and those areas where what I'm saying would not be true for those oyster populations because those oyster populations are much more vulnerable to losing gametes. But in Florida, and especially in Apalachicola Bay, reproductive potential is extremely high and is THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart





with what their life cycle is, but throughout my time diving there in 2012, observing those -those leases, we saw hundreds of egg cases, which confirmed the fact that the snails were there to stay until they were flushed out by serious freshwater input.
Q. Thank you, sir. We're done with that document.

If you could now turn briefly to tab 5, so you were ahead of me.

This is JX-75. And it's a September 2012 oyster assessment report that Georgia's counsel showed you. First of all, can you just explain what this September 2012 report is, just a month after the last report that we were looking at.
A. I believe that this is an effort to synthesize the information into more or less an executive summary or something of that nature.
Q. Okay, sir. And if you could, please, turn to page 2 of that document. I believe Georgia's counsel just directed you to a -- one statement regarding harvesting. And I would like to direct you to this page 2 and the heading Prolonged Drought in Lower River Discharge. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
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Q. And, sir, I don't want to belabor this by reading all of it, given that we just went through the August 2012 report, but if I could, under the first paragraph in that heading, the last sentence says, fresh water is a critical factor driving fluctuations in salinity that prevents destructive marine predators from becoming established.

Sir, is that consistent with your view of what was happening with the depletion event?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And lastly, at the bottom of that page, the last sentence in the last paragraph says, poor recruitment -- poor recruitment and poor survival can be directly attributed to prolonged high salinity environment, which is also confirmed by the presence of marine predators, primarily stone crabs and Florida rock snails, parens, oyster drills.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And is that consistent with your view of what caused the depletion event?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Sir, you were asked some questions about
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reshelling. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And could you tell us which bars in Apalachicola Bay the State of Florida traditionally reshelled?

If you can generalize it.
A. Yes. I'm trying to do it in that way.

I believe that we have made an effort to reshell most of the bars in Apalachicola other than Cat Point Bar.
Q. And why is that?
A. There has been resistance from the fishing community for us to have our heavy equipment on that bar because it has always been the lifeblood, and it really has never needed it. I mean, Cat Point Bar has traditionally been the source of a -- a very sustainable resource, highly renewable resource. It never really needed that much. It was thriving on its own. And I believe that the community probably felt, well, if it's not broke, you don't need to be worried about it. So we did avoid planting there.

But in the eastern portion of the bay, we -over time we planted some on East Hole, some on Platform Bar, Porter's Bar, Peanut Patch. In the THE REPORTING GROUP
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summer areas, we planted on Norman's Lump, Lighthouse, Bulkhead, Hotel. In the western part of the bay, we planted on Green Point, North Spur, planted some on St. Vincent's Bar, planted Cabbage Top, Paradise Flats, Bayou Flats. So there's a good cross-section of the bay that has been rehabilitated by shell planting.
Q. And, sir, Georgia's counsel showed you a document. It was JX-52. But it was reflective of shelling efforts in 2008, 2009, and 2010. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not trying to test your memory on the years;

I'm just trying to move us along.
A. That is testing my memory. I don't --
Q. Thank you, sir.

Now, sir, do you think if -- let me ask it this way. Do you think that the 2012 depletion event could have been prevented if Florida had done more reshelling in the bay?
A. Under the circumstances, no. There's nothing that could have been done with the poor environmental quality. And when I say poor environmental quality, I'm talking about high salinity. Under those circumstances, the areas THE REPORTING GROUP
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| to make sure it was clear that we understand that. You said it wasn't a surprise at all to you. Right? <br> A. It wasn't a surprise to me to see the origin of this depletion. It wasn't surprising to me to see the progression of the depletion. But it was surprising to me to see how catastrophic it actually was. <br> Q. Now, one thing I didn't understand, sir. A couple of times in your responses to Ms. Wine's questions you said it was an inevitable consequence that the primary producing bars would be fished because the other bars had been affected by predators and salinity. Do you recall saying that? <br> A. Yes, I do. <br> MR. ECHOLS: Could you put the map up. <br> Are you able to pull out -- first, let's -- this middle portion here, let's do that. <br> BY MR. ECHOLS: <br> Q. So, now, we have got the Dry Bar/St. Vincent and the Cat Point/East Hole, those are primary producing bars. Correct? <br> A. That's correct. With Cat Point being the primary THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | Q. It's a drought. Doesn't FWC have to manage the fishery during drought as well as during good weather? <br> A. Well, I think I see what you're saying; but as this event progressed, it would have been essentially too late to try and manage individual reefs that had living populations. I mean, I don't understand what the point would be there. <br> You would manage the remaining oysters for what reason? What reason would we come up with to say we're going to close this to fishing when the community at large would say don't deprive us of the economic benefit for no reason? <br> And there wouldn't be a reason for closing that fishery because those oysters were not going to make it to the next harvesting season. We -those oysters in this bay typically live for two summers. And the -- the primary time that we lose oysters to natural mortality in that system is usually July, August, and September. So if you closed an area -- let's say you close an area that has an oyster population on it. And then you come back the next year, you know that that oyster population that was there is not going to be alive; and you also know that without <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
| one. <br> Q. A large portion of the oysters that are harvested in any given year come from those bars. Right? <br> A. A large portion do. <br> Q. This is a managed fishery; isn't it? <br> A. Yes, it is. <br> Q. It's managed by the State? <br> A. Yes, it is. <br> Q. Now, are these bars exempt from being managed by Fish and Wildlife? <br> A. All the bars are managed the same. <br> Q. So are you -- you're not testifying, are you, sir, that because there was a drought and because some of the outlying bars were affected by predation, that required Fish and Wildlife to let the oystermen fish these bars to extinction? <br> A. Would you say that again, please. <br> Q. Fish and Wildlife wasn't required to let the oystermen harvest all the oysters off these primary producing bars. Right? <br> A. They weren't required to. And under normal circumstances, they wouldn't be able to fish all the oysters off of those bars. <br> Q. Right. But this was not normal circumstances. <br> A. No, this was not. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | recruitment, it's not going to be renewed or regenerated or sustained. So a management by closing an area to protect dead oysters is not a sound management decision. <br> Q. But we're not talking about dead oysters, sir. We're talking about live oysters on Cat Point and East Hole. <br> MR. ECHOLS: And can we put up JX-78, please, the last page. And I don't know which tab that is. <br> 78, tab 11, your Honor, is the one we had before. And I'm looking at the last page of JX-78, tab 11 . <br> A. I have it. <br> Q. Okay. <br> And we looked at this earlier. And I just want to make sure it's clear. It's not the case that the fishermen were just harvesting the same amount as they had harvested previously. Correct? <br> A. According to the landing statistics, no. They were harvesting more. <br> Q. Right. So at this point in time when we have the primary producing bars, and you're saying that that's where the concentration is going, it's not |



|  |  | 1022 |  | 1024 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | after the drought. | 1 | have one question as a follow-up. |
| 2 |  | Okay. So we had the drought here, and we didn't | 2 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: One. |
| 3 |  | have a fishery collapse here or here or here or | 3 | MS. WINE: It's only because he invited |
| 4 |  | here or here or here at any of these points? | 4 | it, sir. I can't leave it hanging. |
| 5 |  | would suggest to you that in 1995 and '96 on | 5 | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 6 |  | here that it shows significant decline after that | 6 | BY MS. WINE: |
| 7 |  | drought. | 7 | Q. If you -- I don't know if you're still on tab 11, |
| 8 |  | Okay. Well, how about 1998? You had a drought | 8 | JX-78. We were looking at the landings |
| 9 |  | in 1998, too; do you recall that? | 9 | information on page -- what's titled page 1 at |
| 10 | A. | Not specifically. | 10 | the bottom, although it's the third page of the |
| 11 |  | Okay. I looked it up. After 1998 we had a | 11 | exhibit. And Georgia's counsel pointed out the |
| 12 |  | drought, and we didn't have a fishery collapse. | 12 | numbers for 2010 in Franklin County. |
| 13 |  | You know, we had plenty of landings. There were | 13 | MS. WINE: The 1-nine number, |
| 14 |  | even more then. Right? | 14 | Mr. Walton, and then the 2012 number, the |
| 15 | A. | That's what it indicates. | 15 | 1-seven number for Franklin County. |
| 16 | Q. | Now, let's talk about what was different about | 16 | BY MS. WINE: |
| 17 |  | this drought here. Now, the thing that is | 17 | Q. And I think you asked or indicated that you had |
| 18 |  | different -- or multiple things that are | 18 | an explanation for those numbers; so I'm asking |
| 19 |  | different, in the two years prior to this | 19 | you, sir, what that is? |
| 20 |  | collapse here, that's the only time I have been | 20 | A. Yes, I do. In 2010 that was the year of the |
| 21 |  | able to find -- and you can confirm for me -- | 21 | Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Demand for Gulf |
| 22 |  | reports that you wrote -- resource assessment | 22 | seafood disappeared. We're lucky we harvested |
| 23 |  | reports talking about a "use it or lose it" | 23 | that much of it. We probably harvested what you |
| 24 |  | itude. Would you confirm that? | 24 | see there prior to the spill or prior to all the |
| 25 |  | I can't confirm what you just said, but I brought <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | media coverage of what was happening. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  |  | 1023 |  | 1025 |
| 1 |  | up many times "use it or lose it". I have tried | 1 | The large increase in 2011-2012 that we're |
| 2 |  | my best to explain that approach. | 2 | talking about is during a period of greatest |
| 3 |  | And that was after 2010 with the BP oil spill. | 3 | demand, because the other Gulf states were not |
| 4 |  | Correct? | 4 | producing because they were still suffering from |
| 5 | A. | That approach was brought up, yes. | 5 | various catastrophic events, and the highest |
| 6 | Q. | d in the same two-year time period, we had | 6 | price, which brings oystermen to work. That's |
| 7 |  | reports in 2011 and in 2012 where you warned that | 7 | going to bring them out. |
| 8 |  | Florida Fish and Wildlife was not enforcing size | 8 | Plus, during this period of time, there -- |
| 9 |  | limits. Correct? | 9 | there's not a lot of other job opportunities. |
| 10 |  | I reported that I had heard or had information | 10 | And people will quit their other jobs to oyster |
| 11 |  | that size limits were not being enforced. | 11 | when there is that much money to be gained. |
| 12 | Q. | And you also reported in these same two years | 12 | MS. WINE: Your Honor, I'm done with my |
| 13 |  | prior to the collapse that overharvesting was | 13 | exam. |
| 14 |  | taking place of sub-legal oysters which was | 14 | I did remember that I forgot at the |
| 15 |  | detrimental to recruitment. Right? | 15 | start of my exam to introduce my colleague |
| 16 | A. | etrimental to recruitment and to market size; | 16 | Natalie Rao, who has been assisting me today |
| 17 |  | that's correct. | 17 | at counsel table. And I just wanted to make |
| 18 | Q. | And then we also have in these two years the | 18 | sure to introduce her to your Honor. |
| 19 |  | highest -- the largest -- the highest amount of | 19 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Welcome. |
| 20 |  | pounds of oysters landed in Apalachicola Bay in | 20 | MS. RAO: Good afternoon, your Honor. |
| 21 |  | the prior 25 years. Right? | 21 | MR. ECHOLS: No further questions, your |
| 22 | A. | hat is correct. Highest demand, highest price, | 22 | Honor. |
| 23 |  | more fishermen. | 23 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Berrigan, |
| 24 |  | MR. ECHOLS: No further questions. | 24 | of all the people involved in this, I'm the |
| 25 |  | MS. WINE: Your Honor, briefly, I just | 25 | least informed. So forgive me if I don't ask |
|  |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
|  |  | Mason \& Lockhart |  | Mason \& Lockhart |

the question properly. But in your -- one of your reports you refer to oysters as sessile animals.

THE WITNESS: Sessile.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Would you tell me what the heck a sessile animal is?

THE WITNESS: That -- oysters cement themselves to their substrates, so they're immobile. Oysters cement themselves to the substrate and essentially become immobile. They can't swim. They can't walk. They can't crawl. Wherever they set, for the most part that's where they're going to live their life out.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Why were managed reefs performing better for some portions of 2012 than the other reefs?

THE WITNESS: I would like to take credit for our group saying that we put them in the right places, because we put them in areas where we had the most stable environment for their -- them to grow. They were all somewhat proximal to the river and freshwater discharge.

We had really learned in our process not THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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to construct reefs in the far reaches of Apalachicola Bay or in areas that were too far away from the river because favorable conditions were just not predictable.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Does the success that you had in reshelling some reefs up through 2012 indicate that increased salinity was the primary cause of the oyster collapse?

THE WITNESS: In the areas that we're talking about on Green Point, North Spur, and on East Hole, all of those bars, as we saw in these photographs, started off very good. We had good recruitment on them, good survival, and good growth. Throughout the progress of this depletion event, all of those planted reefs were adversely affected and had -experienced extensive mortality, probably in some places reaching as much as 100 percent. But they were the last ones to go.

I dove on the East Hole plant site, I think, in November of 2012, really kind of in response to this one note, and it still looked pretty good at that time. Of course, it was right beside the Intracoastal

## THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Waterway, which is a conveyance for what little fresh water there was through the bay.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I realize that you were not employed at the time, but has Florida engaged in reshelling since 2012?

THE WITNESS: I'm not certain of this answer; but I believe that there has been almost a continuous reshelling program ongoing. And that reshelling program has primarily been for employment of oystermen that otherwise wouldn't be able to make a living right now.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And do you know what the result was?

THE WITNESS: I do not. And I actually want -- one of my clients has asked me several times to try to find that information out, and I haven't got it. I have tried.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Are you at all familiar with the ACF Stakeholders Sustainable Water Implementation Plan?

THE WITNESS: No, I'm not.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And then, finally -- and this one is just because of the way I read things. Would you go to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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volume 1 and tab 3, JX-150, Joint Exhibit 150. Do you have that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It's -- I understand that you told both counsel that these were your notes. And, yet, the heading says Input For Mark's Report. Did you write that?

THE WITNESS: In reading this and reading some of these sentences are not mine. I'm not certain as to what this was. And I -- I may have conceded that these were my notes; but I -- I am somewhat confused by them. Most of the statements in there are -I agree with.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. You have clarified that for me and made me feel a lot better.

Counsel?

MR. ECHOLS: Nothing, your Honor.
MS. WINE: Nothing further, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We will recess for the weekend.

Alec has furnished counsel with a list THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart















| IV [1] - 814:5 | 859:18, 866:7, | 993:18 | large [16] - 822:10, | learners [1] - 816:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 958:4, 958:7, 987:8, | lack [5] - 890:13, | 894:20, 908:9, | lease [11] - 975:20, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JX-50 [2] - 815:9, } \\ & \text { 846:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $25,989$ | 912:18, 923: | $990: 11,990: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { James [2]-917:23, } \\ & \text { 917:24 } \\ & \text { JAMIE [1]-814:17 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\operatorname{lag}[2]-1018: 19$ | 926:23, 932:14, | 990:14, 990:15 |
|  | JX-52 [3] - 815:9 | 1021:16 | 4:23, 976:1, | leased [5] - 989:8, |
|  | 914:3, 1009:9 | laid [1] - 988:12 | 991:12, 1015:2, | 989:11, 991:1, |
| January [10] - 900:4, | JX-60 [2] - 815:10, | LANCASTER [46] - | 1015:4, 1016:12, | 991:5, 991:6 |
| 900:16, 948:10, | 993:1 | 814:11, 816:2, | 1025: | leaseholder [1] - |
| 951:13, 951:21, | JX-74 [2] - 815:10, | 819:23, 820:4, | large-scale [1] - | 923:7 |
| 951:25, 952:4, | 867:8 | 859:24, 878:5, | 909:12 | leaseholders [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 952:8, 953:14, } \\ & \text { 1018:3 } \end{aligned}$ | JX-75 [3] - 815:11, 868:20, 1006:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 878: 11,886: 7, \\ & 887: 1,892: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { larger [5] - 897:6, } \\ \text { 898:15, 902:5, } \end{gathered}$ | 989:22, 991:7 leases [8] - 925:23 |
| jetties [2] - 976:6, 976:8 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 868:20, 1006:10 } \\ \text { JX-77 [4] - 815:11, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 887: 1,892: 4, \\ & 905: 12,906: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 898:15, 902:5, } \\ & 984: 17,984: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { leases [8] - 925:23, } \\ 926: 6,975: 19, \end{gathered}$ |
| 976:8 | 816:12, 941:10, | 906:5, 913:20, | largest [1] - 1023:19 | 989:25, 990:16, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { job [5] - 857:7, 875:23, } \\ 911: 17,916: 2, \end{gathered}$ | 995:20 | 913:23, 939:7, | larvae [7] - 825:2, | 990:18, 991:14, |
| 911:17, 916:2, 1025:9 | JX-78 [7] - 815:12 | 939:13, 939:22 | 825:9, 825:11, | 1006:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1025:9 } \\ & \text { jobs }[2]-983: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 948:22, 1017:8, | 939:24, 940:5, | 826:10, 826:15, | least [12]-841:13, |
| 1025:10 | 1017:13, 1019:18, | 955:10, 968:4, | 902:21, 902:22 | 871:16, 892:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Joe [6] - 879:9, } \\ & \text { 888:25, 889:3, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 972:7, 972:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { larval [4] - 824:22, } \\ & \text { 825:3, 825:5, 826:10 } \\ & \text { last [46] - 820:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 912:13, 961:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 888: 25,889: 3, \\ & 933: 5,933: 7,950: 12 \end{aligned}$ | K | 978:19, 990:6, |  | 962:17, 963:20, |
| John [1] - 879:8 | Kal [2] - 884:12, 886:9 | 010:19, 1011: | $832: 1,832: 1$ | 1025:25 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Joint [5] - 914:3, } \\ \text { 922:11, 922:14, } \\ 948: 22,1029: 1 \end{gathered}$ | Kate [2] - 909:18 | 1011:5, 1024:2 | 832:16, 846:2, | leave [3] - 919:7, |
|  | $946: 15$ | 25:19, 1025:23, | 846:5, 846:21, | 962:8, 1024:4 |
|  | keep [7]-844:10, | 1026:5, 1026:15, | 849:8, 851:7 | leaving [2] - 858:5, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { joint }[3]-846: 14, \\ 867: 8,868: 20 \end{gathered}$ | 851:25, 882:8, | 027:5, 1028:3 | 851:13, 863:8, | 961:24 |
|  | 905:16, 916:18, | 028:13, 1028:19, | 867:18, 870:6, | leeway [1] - 885:23 |
| JOSH [1] - 814:21 | 957:3, 972:15 | 1028:23, 1029:4, | 871:4, 911:5, 912:6, | left [12] - 816:11, |
| JOSHUA [1] - 814:23 <br> judge [4]-866:10, | keeping [1] - 960:17 | 1029:16, 1029:23 | 912:7, 917:25, | 880:19, 899:10, |
|  | kidding [1] - 897:13 | land [1] - 896:16 | 925:9, 933:25, | 912:15, 912:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 905:3, 939:15, } \\ & \text { 954:15 } \\ & \text { judgment }[1]-883: 1 \end{aligned}$ | killed [1] - 979:10 | landed [7] - 896:6, | 935:2, 938:20, | 912:24, 918:21, |
|  | Kimbro [3]-891:19, | 897:15, 897:19, | $941: 5,950: 24,$ | 919:3, 951:12, |
|  | 891:21, 940:10 | 797:23, 952:21, | 969:3, 976:4, | 962:19, 965:13, |
| July [11] - 817:4, | Kimbro's [3] - 900:5, | 952:22, 1023:20 | 977:24, 994:10, | 1013:7 |
| $859: 19,861: 10$, $871: 18,890: 2$ | 940:13, 940:19 kind 9 - $852 \cdot 15$ | landing [2] - 1017:21, | 994:18, 996:9, | left-hand [1] - 880:19 |
| 915:12, 929:22, | kind [9] - 852:15, <br> 864:4, 880:10 | 1018:17 | 1001:12, 1003:16, | legal [42] - 819:13, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 864: 4,880: 10, \\ & 888: 17,902: 12, \end{aligned}$ | landings [33] - 828:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 1004: 13,1006: 14 \\ & 1007: 4,1007: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 831:6, 834:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 949: 22,974: 23, \\ & 982: 4,1016: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $903: 15,965: 18,$ | 942:22, 942:24, | 1007:13, 1013:4, | 835:4, 835:9, |
| June [4]-949:20, 1019:23, 1020:8, | 986:22, 1027:22 | 943:7, 944:15, | 1017:9, 1017:12, | 835:12, 835:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1019:23, 1020:8, } \\ & \text { 1031:17 } \end{aligned}$ | kinds [1] - 884:18 | $945: 25,946: 3,$ | 1018:25, 1020:2, | 836:10, 836:13, |
|  | Knickerbocker [6] - <br> 884:13, 884:15 | $946: 4,946: 7$ | $1020: 25,1027: 20$ | 836:17, 838:5, |
| juvenile [19]-819:7, | 884:13, 884:15, <br> 886.9, 966.6, 966.9 | 946:10, 947:16, | lastly [1] - 1007:12 | 838:15, 838:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 827:7, 831:6, 835:9, } \\ & \text { 835:10, 838:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 886: 9,966: 6,966: 9, \\ & 966: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 949: 15,949: 17 \\ & 949: 18,950: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { late }[4]-834: 5,918: 4, \\ & 982: 5,1016: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 839:17, 839:19, |
| 839:17, 840:14, | Knickerbocker's [1] - | 950:21, 951:7, | lawsuit [2] - 862:11, | 844:17, 845:2, |
| $841: 17,843: 20$, $844: 19,845: 3$, | 886:15 | 952:17, 954:18, | 862:17 | 845:15, 848:1, |
| 848:1, 870:10, | knocked [1] - 884:25 | 955:14, 956:1, | lawyers [1] - 862:14 | 848:5, 848:6, 856:6, |
|  | knowledge [3] - | 956:7, 956:8, | $\text { lay }[1]-852: 22$ | 860:23, 870:10, |
| 920:21, 921:4, | 852:13, 854:19, $1013 \cdot 8$ | 956:24, 957:8, $977: 3,1018: 14$ | layered [1] - 890:17 | 870:16, 871:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 921:11, 1005:19, } \\ & \text { 1012:20 } \end{aligned}$ <br> juveniles [4]-835:14, | knowledgeable [3] - | 977:3, 1018:14, 1019:21. 1022:13. | layman's [1] - 826:2 | 871:7, 871:9, |
|  | knowledgeable [3] - 852:14, 852:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1019:21, 1022:13, } \\ & \text { 1024:8 } \end{aligned}$ | lead [1] - 867:22 | 876:23, 900:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 845:15, 881:3, } \\ & 935: 12 \\ & \text { JX [1] - 859:13 } \\ & \text { JX-150 [11] - 815:12, } \\ & \text { 859:13, 859:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $905: 18$ | lands [3]-897:14, | 999:19 | 961:4, 984:24, |
|  | known [1] - 907:19 | 989:12, 989:18 | leads [1] - 986:11 | 985:14, 1023:14 |
|  |  | 992:19, 1003:8, | learn [1] - 816:4 | 834:16, 838:5, |
|  | labeled [2] - 990:1 | REPORTING | DUP d [1] - 1026:25 | 844:17, 848:5, |












| settling [1] - 825:9 | 916:23, 918:23, | 908:5, 908:7 | 848:17 | 886:7, 886:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| seven [2]-852:17, | 919:3, 925:19 | simpler [1] - 862:8 | slide [10] - 874:20, | 895:16, 896:9, |
| 912:12 | shoot [1] - 916:6 | simply [2] - 980:25, | 875:4, 880:4, 900:1, | 897:25, 900:9, |
| seven-year [1] - | short [1] - 855:2 | 997:21 | 4:11, 935:17 | 906:1, 910:3, |
| 912:12 | shorter [1] - 889:11 | single [7] - 893:16, | 936:19, 937:18, | 919:22, 921:13, |
| several [3] - 894:2, | shortly [1] - 914:21 | 904:6, 904:7 | 938:4, 1020:25 | 923:4, 923:16, |
| 974:3, 1028:17 | shot [1] - 960:16 | 904:18, 904:22, | slides [6] - 898: | 27:5, 939:15 |
| severe [2] - 821:19, | show [15] - 842:6, | $905: 22,1018: 4$ | 919:15, 930:17, | 947:7, 947:8, 948:8, |
| 988:16 | 885:11, 919:9, | site [9]-915:12, 916.24, 917:12 | 934:3, 969:2, 969:17 | 948:14, 948:20, <br> 954:15, 960:14 |
| severely [3] - 817:7, 938.2, 1000.16 | $\begin{aligned} & 919: 18,924: 22, \\ & 971: 17.971: 19 . \end{aligned}$ | 916:24, 917:12, 926:15. 926:20. | slow [1] - 816:4 <br> slowly [1] - 856:3 | $995: 17,1003: 22,$ |
| 938:2, 1000:16 | 971:17, 971:19 987:17, 990:2 | 926:15, 926:20 <br> 927:1, 932:14 | slowly [1] - 856:3 <br> small [20] - 819:5 | 1004:3, 1010:21 |
| 929:25 | 993:16, 993:17, | $932: 18,1027: 21$ | 819:6, 834:22, | sort [2] - 964:12, |
| shallow [1] - 1000:1 | 1001:2, 1021:14 | Site [3]-926:13, | 835:18, 836:6, | 984:8 |
| shape [5] - 909:7, | $1021: 24,1021: 25$ | $931: 23,932: 3$ | 836:22, 836:25, 838:22. 839:12 | Sound [13]-928:25, 929:3, 972:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 928: 18,929: 2, \\ & 929 \cdot 5 \quad 929 \cdot 9 \end{aligned}$ | showed [7] - 960:3, 968:17 968.21 | sites [4] - 915:24, | 838:22, 839:12, | $973: 3,975: 14$ |
| 929:5, 929:9 <br> shared [1] - 911: | $\begin{aligned} & 968: 17,968: 21, \\ & 991: 23,993: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $932: 12$ | 856:7, 860:25, | 980:3, 991:18, |
| shell [46] - 819:6, | 1006:12, 1009:8 | situation [22]-833:9, | 865:21, 871:11, | $999: 3,1000: 5,$ |
| 819:8, 824:3, 825:7, | showing [8] - 892:2, 949:14 957:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 836: 15,838: 18 \\ & 840: 11,840: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 910: 19,934: 24, \\ & 934: 25,984: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1000: 12,1000: 14 \\ & 1000: 22,1001: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 825:12, 863:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 949: 14,957: 16, \\ & 988 \cdot 16 \quad 993 \cdot 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 840: 11,840: 19 \\ & 841: 20.842: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 934: 25,984: 23, \\ & 985: 11 \end{aligned}$ | sound [3] - 885:2 |
| 865:17, 866:17, | 988:16, 993:16, 1000:16, 1003: | 841:20, 842:8 | 985:11 | 910:10, 1017:4 |
| 867:25, 881:25 884.9, 887.7 | 1018:24 | $2,882: 22$ | 835:5, 837:8, | sounds [2] - 959:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 884: 9,887: 7,893: 2, \\ & 893: 3,893: 4,893: 8, \end{aligned}$ | shown [7] - 905:7, | 893:21, 897:12, | $837: 25,876: 18$ | 959:8 |
| 893:9, 893:11, | 928:16, 928:17 | 898:12, 899:9 | 76:23, 881:1, | source [4] - 955:7, |
| 893:15, 893:18, | 957:15, 989:5, | 899:18, 900:9 | 938:15, 975:7 | 973:14, 975:21, |
| 893:25, 894:9, | 992:2, 995:25 | 929:25, 933:16, | 983:10, 983:20 | 1008:16 |
| 894:12, 894:13 | shows [5] - 869:4 | 979:18, 979:21, | Smith [1] - 892:6 | south [1] - 973:6 |
| 894:14, 894:18, | 901:2, 920:20 | 1019:14 | snail [3] - 940:2 | southeastern [1] - |
| 898:14, 898:19, | 992:14, 1022:6 | situations [1] - 857:17 | 979:25, 1005:16 | 1013:18 |
| 899:22, 900:10, | shrimp [1] - 827:18 | six [1] - 953:2 | snails [8] - 999:13 | southern [3] - 928:25, |
| 908:2, 908:12 | shucked [1] - 908:13 | size [57] - 819:1 | 05:7, 1005:10 | 974:7, 981:20 |
| 920:21, 921:5, | side [6] - 833:15, | 825:19, 825:20 | 005:20, 1005:22, | southward [1] - |
| 921:6, 927:24, | 5:7, 855:8 | 4:16, 834:20 | 005:23, 1006:4, | 997:25 |
| 936:11, 937:12 | 5:20, 943:24 | 835:1, 836:13, | 1007:18 | southwestern [1] - |
| 981:4, 981:22, | 971:2 | 19, 837:2 | snippet [2] - 969:10, | 925:2 |
| 987:5, 989:14, | sideways [1] - 883:15 | 7:4, 837:22 | 969:25 | sovereignty [1] - |
| 1009:7 | sign [2] - 926:22, | 838:1, 838:5 | soft [1] - 980:9 | 989:11 |
| shelled [3] - 910:9 | 927:19 | 839:20, 840:6 | sold [1] - 941:24 | spat [33] - 823:12, |
| 935:25, 938:1 | significant [5] | 840:7, 840:8, | solution [1] - 998:10 | 824:8, 824:9, |
| shellfish [1] - 990:9 | 878:25, 909:24 | 840:12, 841:17, | sometimes [3] - | 824:17, 825:10, |
| shelling [10]-907:16, | 924:17, 925:12, | 843:6, 843:14, 843:18, 844:1 | 907:19, 923:10, | 825:11, 825:13, |
| 908:1, 910:15, <br> 910:19, 911:4 | 1022:6 | $44: 19,845: 3$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 825: 14,825: 18 \\ & 825: 21,825: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 910:19, 911:4, } \\ & \text { 912:3, 913:5, 913:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { significantly [1] - } \\ & 966: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $848: 2,848: 5,856: 6$ | $835: 11,868: 22$ | 825:25, 826:2, |
| 913:15, 1009:10 | signs [1] - 1000:1 | 56:15, 856:23, | 79:15, 885:18, | 839:12, 868:2, |
| shells [7]-826:1, | silt [6] - 882:8, 882:11, | 860:24, 861:7, | 933:11, 1026:23, | 868:14, 881:2, |
| 883:7, 883:10, | 882:24, 883:1, | 863:14, 866:15, | 1029:13 | 887:11, 887:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 883: 16,894: 20, \\ & 908: 11.982: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 883:3, 887:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 870: 11,871: 5, \\ & 871: 9,903: 25, \end{aligned}$ | somewhere [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 915: 18,916: 7 \\ & 919: 11,920: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 908:11, 982:1 | similar [8] - 849:9, | 871:9, 903:25, 904:20. 921:1. | 910:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 919:11, 920:24, } \\ & 920: 25,921: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| shellstock [2] - 863:16, $866: 17$ | $855: 25,868: 22$, $868: 23,885: 1$ | 926:23, 935:11, | sooner [1] - 984:7 sorry [41] - 824:12 | 921:7, 924:4, |
| 863:16, 866:17 | 868:23, 885:1, | $947: 1,947: 4,979: 8$ | sorry [41] - 824:12, | 921.7, 924.4, <br> 932.13, 935.12 |
| Shields [6] - 879:9, 888:25, 889:3, | 895:18, 907:10, $992 \cdot 19$ | 982:11, 982:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 832: 11,846: 17 \\ & 847: 4,847: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 932: 13,935: 12, \\ & 937: 13,979: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 888: 25,889: 3, \\ & 896: 11,914: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 992:19 | 983:21, 984:14, | 847:4, 847:5, | spawned [2] - 902:20, |
| $950: 12$ | 922:23, 942:1, | 985:5, 985:7, | 862:7, 863:1, | 902:22 |
| shields [9]-883:13, 889.24, 890.3 | 952:24, 953:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1023:8, 1023:11, } \\ & \text { 1023:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 867:11, 872:18, | spawning [2] - <br> 840:21, 840:24 |
| 889:24, 890:3, | $961: 12$ | 1023:16 | 874:13, 881:16, | 840:21, 840:24 <br> speaking [2] - 855: |






