
A. I do. Correct?
A. I think so. next to it. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If we look, please, at the document in tab 19, which is GX-676, if you would see here, sir, we have Joe Shields, who is a DACS employee.
A. I -- I think so, yes.
Q. And he's e-mailing Kal Knickerbocker, who is his supervisor at DACS. Right?
A. I know Kal is employed with DACS. I'm not sure of the supervisory relationship.
Q. My understanding, correct me if I'm wrong, is that Mr. Knickerbocker succeeded Mr. Berrigan. Generally does that sound right?
Q. Now, here we have Mr. Shields is e-mailing Mr. Knickerbocker. It says, Kal, the attached pictures were taken by Inspector Nancy Horton and are of oysters received by Water Street Seafood, from Susan Reeder. Obviously they are undersized, but they coincide with what we discovered with our assessments. And the result is a 60-pound bag comprised of undersized oysters, dead shell, and shell hash matrix. I have no information on where these particular oysters are from, but these pictures could be THE REPORTING GROUP
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forwarded to FWC and utilized when they are making oyster resource based decisions.

Do you see that?
Q. And this is the type of thing that we just talked about where if DACS ran across undersized oysters in its surveys of dealers, it would pass that information along to FWC?
A. I would expect so.
Q. And there is nothing wrong with that. In fact, that's probably part of their responsibility; wouldn't you say?
A. I would expect that in routine coordination.
Q. And just to have some nice color pictures, you can see, if you turn to the next pages, you have got apparently what Ms. Horton -- Inspector Horton passed along, pictures of what she found with these undersized oysters in the plants or in the -- rather, in the dealer. And she puts a pen

You can flip to the next one here, too, to give a sample of what the size is.

So -- and, again, this is relatively ordinary course what you would expect them to do.

## A. I -- I expect them to communicate any of their findings.

Q. Okay. Can we turn to tab 20, please.

Now, in tab 20 --
MR. ECHOLS: This is not -- it's 1306.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. It's GX-1306. You will see that you have at the bottom of the first page the e-mail from Joe Shields to Mr. Knickerbocker that we just read. And then in the -- two-thirds of the way down Mr. Knickerbocker forwards it to Jim Estes of FWC. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he says, Jim, these pictures were taken by our processing plant inspector today.

It proceeds up to Mr. Estes, who sends this to a Louie Roberson?
A. Roberson.
Q. Roberson, I'm sorry. Who is Mr. Roberson?
A. At the time Mr. Roberson was the regional director for the Northwest Region at FWC.
Q. Okay. So he's a FWC person. Right?
A. He has since retired.
Q. At the time Mr. Roberson, the regional manager of FWC, he, above there, e-mails back to Jim Estes, THE REPORTING GROUP
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this is ridiculous. The oystermen can have 20 percent shorts in a bag anyway. This doesn't prove much of anything. Louie.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And this is Mr. Roberson writing back to

Mr. Estes. Mr. Estes responds, thought you would like it, above. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. If we could turn, please, to tab 21 , in tab 21 is GX-677. And we have here an e-mail from -- at the bottom, from David Heil to Jim Estes. And then it looks like above that, he re-sent the e-mail -- reforwarded it to Mr. Estes. That's at least the way it appears here.

If we start at the bottom, please, Mr. Heil, who is of FWC; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And he's e-mailing Mr. Estes. And he says in the paragraph, several calls today from oyster fishers requesting Apalachicola Bay to be closed. Rationale, fishers taking too many very small oysters and taking unculled oysters, including shell material, in that first couple of sentences.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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And then at the very bottom it says, of the above, taking shell material results in long-term damage.

Now, Mr. Heil is familiar with oysters and the oyster fishery; would you agree?
A. Yes, I would.
Q. And do you read his statement here, taking shell material results in long-term damage, to be that if oystermen are removing shell from the reef, that that is damaging to the reef structure?
A. I think it would depend on the amount that that would occur at. I would assume they are filling their bags and trying to sell bags, and they're collecting shell.
Q. And would you agree with Mr. Heil that taking shell material results in long-term damage?
A. I don't think that $I$ would reach that same conclusion. I wouldn't even know to what degree, what scale that's occurring.
Q. Would you agree that Mr. Heil is more familiar and knowledgeable of the oyster reefs and fishery than you, yourself, are?
A. I would agree with that.
Q. And if we go to the e-mail above then where Mr. Heil re-emails Mr. Estes, he notes, for what THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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it is worth, Mark Berrigan told me that one of the Apalachicola dealers told him that there is indeed a large-scale harvest of 1 -inch oysters occurring.

Now, yesterday we talked about whether the harvest of sub-legal and small oysters could have an impact on the health of the oyster fishery. Do you recall that?
A. I recall.
Q. Now, would the large-scale harvest of 1 -inch oysters have an impact on the biological ability of the oysters to reproduce and grow to adult and harvestable stage?
A. Again, it would depend on the scale you're expressing. Large scale is a little bit vague as to what that is.
Q. And we had the brief discussions about the millions of gametes and such that oysters use when they reproduce. Do you know whether 1 -inch oysters have reached the point at which they are reproductive age?
A. I would defer that question to others testifying.
Q. All right. I would like to change topics, if we could, please, sir. Now, what we just looked at, I guess it was two documents back, was Mr. Heil THE REPORTING GROUP
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noting that the taking of shell material can cause long-term damage. And as you said, it would perhaps depend upon the scale. But I wanted to use that to move into the restoration activities that the State of Florida would engage in in the process called reshelling. Are you familiar with that?
A. Reshelling, cultching, yes, sir.
Q. And you would agree with me, would you not, that reshelling and cultching are best management practices when dealing with oysters?
A. It's a best management practice that's been employed for many, many decades. Correct.
Q. And similarly, reshelling and cultching are part of the restoration efforts of oyster reefs to enhance those reefs?
A. It's part of the restoration and maintenance of the resource.
Q. Similarly, the reshelling, the cultching is part of the process to assist the substrate of portions of the reef; is that correct?
A. Right. Substrate for attachment of spat.
Q. As Mr. Berrigan was explaining to us yesterday -actually, I guess on Friday, you need to have the hard surface, the substrate, for the spat to land THE REPORTING GROUP
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on to then be able to grow up to become adult oysters. Right?
A. I would certainly defer to Mr. Berrigan on that.
Q. Do you recall, sir, that in the August 2012 DACS report that was attached to the Governor's letter for the disaster declaration, that report noted that the reef substrate had been degraded to some extent?
A. Yes. To some extent $I$ recall that statement.
Q. And in your written direct, sir, you state -- and this is in paragraph 35 of your written direct -you state that hundreds of acres were cultched in Franklin County between 2010 and 2015.

Do you recollect that?
A. Right. For example, hundreds of acres were culched just in Franklin County between the beginning of 2010 and 2015.
Q. Right. So here we are in paragraph 35, you go down six lines; and there's the sentence beginning, for example, hundreds of acres were culched just in Franklin County between the beginning of 2010 and the end of 2015.

But now, sir, it is not the case, is it, that hundreds of acres were cultched or reshelled prior to 2012-2013, the time of the oyster
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1 some reshelling done after this point in time, if 2 we can look at the next slide, please. And you 3 should have it there also in front of you.

And so in order for us to get to the hundreds of acres being reshelled, we have to go to 2014 and 2015. And, again, this information comes from JX-163. And it shows that the state did do some reshelling in those years in 2014 and 2015. Correct?
A. That's what it shows, yes.
Q. And that's accurate; is it not?
A. I would assume if it's drawn from this spread sheet, it is.
Q. And, in fact, the moneys that the State used to do that reshelling it received as part of the disaster declaration request that had been -when the federal government declared a disaster and provided those funds. Is that right?
A. I know that we received a significant amount of funding from that disaster declaration.
Q. And at that point in time FWC and the State of Florida believed that it did make sense to engage in this reshelling activity because it's a best management practice and would, hopefully, assist with the restoration of the oyster resource?
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```
A. Well, as I think you mentioned, it's a best
    management practice that's been employed for
    decades. And when the environmental conditions
    are correct, it helps in recovery.
Q. And especially as is the case here, now for 2013,
    we know we were out of the drought. Right?
A. You know, I -- I'm not that familiar with the
climatic data. All I know is I'm familiar with the low flows and high salinities.
            I want to be cautious not to testify when I'm
        not an expert on the meteorological side of this
        equation. So --
Q. And, in fact, I'm going to change topics now.
A. Okay.
Q. But in order for us to get this out of the way,
since I won't be reading every sentence in every
paragraph, we can agree that there was a drought
in 2011 and 2012?
A. Based on everything I reviewed, yes; that's correct.
Q. And we can agree, too, that because of this drought, there were low flows coming into the -from the river into the bay?
A. I would agree there was a high salinity in the bay.
THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Well, as I think you mentioned, it's a best management practice that's been employed for decades. And when the environmental conditions are correct, it helps in recovery.
Q. And especially as is the case here, now for 2013, we know we were out of the drought. Right?
A. You know, I -- I'm not that familiar with the climatic data. All I know is I'm familiar with
I want to be cautious not to testify when I'm not an expert on the meteorological side of this equation. So --
Q. And, in fact, I'm going to change topics now.
A. Okay.
Q. But in order for us to get this out of the way, since I won't be reading every sentence in every paragraph, we can agree that there was a drought in 2011 and 2012? bay
```

Q. Yes, exactly. There were low flows and there was high salinity and there were predators. That's what happens in droughts. Right?
A. Well, again, I'm not testifying as from the causal perspective. I can give you qualitative and say, yes, there was high salinity. And certainly drought would be part and parcel to high salinity. That would seem to make logical sense.
Q. Now, sir, it is the responsibility of FWC to manage the fishery both in years of drought as well as in years of good environmental conditions; is it not?
A. That's what we do throughout the state through many droughts, through many floods, yes.
Q. And similarly, with respect to Apalachicola Bay, it is the responsibility of FWC to manage the fishing of any of the oyster reefs in the bay, including the most commercially productive reefs like Cat Point and East Hole; is it not?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let's then change topics. And I would like to ask you about landings, about FWC's collection and tracking of landings and licenses. And is it correct, sir, that FWC is the responsible agency THE REPORTING GROUP
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for issuing fishing licenses?
A. We are. And in this instance, it would be the saltwater products license; and in the Apalachicola Bay, a harvesting license. It's a special license.
Q. And when -- once somebody obtains this license, then they are permitted to go and harvest oysters anywhere in the bay subject to whatever the restrictions are that are imposed by FWC; is that right?
A. Subject to the restrictions, which can be geographic, and certainly the bags and size.
Q. And, now, can we go back briefly to JX-77, which is behind tab 4 of your binder.
A. Okay. I'm there, sir.
Q. And in that tab I would ask you to page back to the second page of the August 2012 DACS report.
A. I'm sorry. What page are you on, sir?
Q. I'm sorry. Page 2 of the DACS report that has the table in it.
A. Okay. Table 1, I assume?
Q. Now, you see here, sir, in the 2012 DACS report this table 1. It reports the years, running down the left, the pounds of meats that are harvested, trips, and then there is the column No Licenses.
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the record, 2011, there are 2.81 million pounds harvested; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in 2012, 3.03 million pounds harvested. Correct?
A. Just -- I would just add that the 2012 data, I don't see that on the table 1 that you're referring to that I believe you said you drew -you drew your information from this exhibit as well as another?
Q. Well, actually, I have -- for the Court's purposes, you know, here at the very bottom, there are exhibits that are the data files that contain the full period of time. So we have identified on this chart, there is a GX-1248-meaning it's a Georgia exhibit -- which is also identical to a Florida exhibit, FX-839. And so that there wouldn't be any confusion of what I was using, I sent that to your counsel to be able to confirm that these are the appropriate numbers. Okay?
A. Okay. I'm not trying to be argumentative. I just want to make sure -- if I'm referring to table 1 in this chart that I hadn't seen, I want to make sure that $I$ understood what you were THE REPORTING GROUP
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referring to.
Q. Sure. We're off of table 1 now.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. And it is also accurate, as Mr. Berrigan testified -- and I'm not sure if you were here for that part or not -- that then after this historically high amount of landings in -- that were harvested in 2011 and 2012, there was a significant drop-off in subsequent years. Correct?
A. That's what this table reflects.
Q. And that's what the official State of Florida landings data reflects. Correct?
A. I'll take your word based on these docs, correct -- on the exhibits.
Q. Just by way of characterization of this stretch of this time period of data, would you agree with me, sir, that it is not the case that it's the same rate of harvest in every year over the period of these decades?
A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?
Q. Sure. These bars differ, in some cases substantially, by as much as three or four times; there's different amounts of pounds that are harvested in different years over this past THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
decade or two?
A. Sure. I mean, there's -- the bars show you that it's -- again, going back to 1988, show you that it varies.
Q. And it's not the case that the same amount of oysters are harvested in every single year. There can be substantial variation. Right?
A. Correct. Again, you're going back to 1988. The fishery has been active for much longer than that.
Q. Okay. I'm finished with this topic, this area. I want to move to another section, if we could.

And now, sir, what I'm going to ask you about next is the process by which the disaster declaration was requested and the communications with the federal government and the development of the FWC report. And in order to do that, I have got different documents for you. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay, sir. And I think, as you testified yesterday, you, yourself, were not personally involved in the drafting of the FWC report that was used in the disaster declaration; but as part of your responsibilities, you may have seen it along the way. Is that correct? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. It's possible that I had. But I was not directly involved in developing that. Correct.
Q. All right. Let's talk about the process that the FWC report and the request for the disaster declaration was conducted. And I believe, as you testified, it's David Heil and Jim Estes of FWC were generally the principal people involved in the drafting of the disaster declaration?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. I'm sorry. Not the declaration, but the FWC report?
A. Yes. In drafting the report, correct.
Q. Now, the -- at the beginning of this process when FWC and DACS identified that there was a significant problem with the oyster population, when Florida wanted to request the disaster declaration, the first thing they did was to go to Georgia to ask for some assistance in drafting the request. Isn't that true?
A. I'm not aware of that.
Q. You're not aware of the fact that -- that Florida, when they wanted to put together their letter to the Department of Commerce, asked Georgia for help?
A. I -- I am not. I'm not aware of that. THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Okay. I'm there. Sorry.
Q. You're there. No problem.
A. Yes.

MR. ECHOLS: And tab 32, this is the first tab in the new binder, your Honor.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And you'll see here that we have got an e-mail. If you go down to the -- near the bottom of this page, you can see here, sir, an e-mail from a Pat Geer from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources to a Jim Page and to Mr. Heil -- to David Heil. Correct?
A. I see that.
Q. And what Mr. Geer sends to Mr. Heil and says is attached is a document containing the original letter from our Governor at the time requesting a disaster be declared, and response from NMFS requesting additional info and our response with supporting info. Hope this helps.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. If you turn in to the attachment, do you see there, sir, that what Mr. Geer, from the Georgia THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Department of Natural Resources, is sending Mr. Heil of FWC is the letter that the Georgia Governor, at that point Roy Barnes, sent to the Department of Commerce in connection with the -their blue crab disaster request. Do you see that?
A. I see a letter from Roy Barnes. I hadn't seen this before. If you would like me to read it, I certainly can.
Q. You certainly can. I'm -- as I said before, I'm going to refer to just a couple of things; but I don't want to cut you off from looking at whatever you would like to look at.

## A. I hadn't seen it, so I apologize; but I would like to review it.

Q. Sure.
A. Okay, sir. I have read it. Thank you.
Q. Very good. And we don't need to turn back to it; but, you know, of course, that in September 2012, Governor Scott wrote to the U.S. Department of Commerce requesting a disaster declaration for the oyster fishery. Right?

That's our principal document we have looked at many times.
A. Yes, I'm aware of that letter. THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. There are a couple things that I just briefly wanted to touch upon that related to the Georgia request as compared to the Florida request. And I think you can just keep this one in front of you, you know, because I have put together a comparison that, hopefully, will make this easier.
A. Thank you.
Q. And so if we could look at the first -- the slide 11 here. Do you see we have the Georgia letter which was provided by Mr. Geer to Mr. Heil to assist in Florida's request for the disaster declaration. And I'm looking here at what I believe is the second paragraph, if you have that Georgia letter in front of you. And I have put on the table, so that you can see it, the similar text from Governor Scott's letter requesting a disaster declaration.
A. Okay.
Q. And as you can see, would you agree with me that we have got quite a bit of similarity between these two letters. So in the Georgia letter, it says, the State of Georgia has experienced an unprecedented decline in the abundance of blue crabs within our coastal estuaries, a direct THE REPORTING GROUP
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consequence of which has been a significant loss of income to commercial fishermen, in that sentence. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And I'm not going to read the entirety of Governor Scott's letter; but do you see that in Governor Scott's letter it says basically the same thing, that Florida had experienced an unprecedented decline in the abundance -- but instead of blue crab, it says oysters. Right?
A. In general that's -- they're similar in that regard.
Q. Okay. And I'll just refer to one other section of the letter, if we can go to the next slide, please.

And so we have here on the bottom of the page of the State of Georgia's letter the line that begins disaster relief funds. Are you there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see in the State of Georgia's letter that the Georgia Department of Natural Resources gave to Mr. Heil to assist Florida, it states, disaster relief funds authorized by the relevant statutes are needed to, 1 , further assess the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Again, thank you. Please keep reviewing. I would rather take care of all misconceptions and explain anything needed before we submit report.

And this is then the responsive chain. And for whatever reason, these print out so odd.

You have got Mr. Branstetter responding to Mr. Heil that the submission to NOAA includes some information related to Executive Orders at the top there. Do you see that?
A. I'm sorry. I got lost there.
Q. Yes. We're back on the page -- because we had to flip back and forth; but we're back on the page that has at the top Florida's Governor.
A. Okay.
Q. And at -- to paraphrase this paragraph, he's noting that the information that's provided to NOAA indicates that the Governor issued Executive Orders that allowed for departures from the standard limits on harvesting. Right?
A. That's what it states.
Q. And then at the very bottom of that e-mail, he says, nevertheless, a disaster has to be beyond the scope and control of management. This relaxation of harvest restrictions in 2010 could be a reason for lack of oysters in 2013.
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## Right?

A. That's what I read.
Q. All right. Now, we have to continue further up to Mr. Heil responding to Mr. Branstetter. And I will paraphrase rather than read. He responds and says, none of the oyster rules were deviated or waived. And if that had been asked for, it would have been denied. Right?
A. That's how I understand that. Correct.
Q. And then Dr. Branstetter tells Mr. Heil in the e-mail in the center of that page, just remember, your agriculture report states such harvest did occur.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And this is part of the back and forth communications that the federal government and FWC had in connection with the disaster declaration?
A. It is a portion of it. Correct.
Q. All right. Now, we have to flip all the way to the very front page, please, still in GX-569.
A. Okay.
Q. And in the middle of that page, we have an April 23 e-mail from David Heil to Jim Estes. So THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
now we're just internal to FWC. Mr. Branstetter is not on this part of it. And Mr. Estes -Mr. Heil tells Mr. Estes, as he's forwarding all of this with some other things that we'll just touch on briefly, see latest e-mail response below from NOAA Fisheries Service. And then in all caps and all bold and underlined, I will need assistance to address this. Then it says below are highlighted excerpts from the DACS report addressing fishery practices, overharvest, and/or undersize harvest. Correct?
A. Yes. I read that the same.
Q. And I'm not going to go through and read any of this; but, you know, I'll just give you and the Court an opportunity to flip through what Mr. Heil pasted into this e-mail to Mr. Estes. And I think you'll see that it's a copy of the August 2012 report with his highlighting on every instance that harvesting, fishing pressure, extensive harvesting, continuous harvesting occurs.

Let me know when you have had a chance to review.
A. Well, as you suggested, I'm just scanning the highlighted portions.

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. Sure.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. All right. Let's -- let's look at another exhibit. This is a joint exhibit, Joint Exhibit 90. It should be behind tab 35 of your binder.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And Joint Exhibit 90 is another series of e-mails -- and I'm only going to look at a very couple of them -- between Mr. Branstetter -Dr. Branstetter and David Heil. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And let's go, if we could, just on the very first page -- I'm only going to look at part of this page and the next. On the very first page at the bottom we have on April 24 the -- on Wednesday, April 24, down below there from -- where it says from Mr. Heil. And Mr. Heil writes to Mr. Branstetter, information received.

And here we are in the very, very, very bottom paragraph. It is my understanding that FWC will respectfully disagree that oysters have undergone overfishing. Because there is no prescribed threshold, oysters are not considered overfished. FWC recognizes that in recent THE REPORTING GROUP
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|  | 1450 |
| :---: | :---: |
| A. Okay. I'm there. <br> Q. Sir, I think you said you had some familiarity with Ms. Petes. What do you understand her background to be? <br> A. I -- she -- I believe her post-doc work is dealing with the invertebrates, particularly oysters, in the northwest Florida Apalachicola Bay area and particularly in how it relates to salinity regimes and -- amongst other things. <br> Q. And, sir, if you turn to the page with the Bates numbers -- those are the numbers on the bottom right in this exhibit -- that ends 3842 . This is in the attachments to her memo. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Sir, do you understand there's an article there entitled Ecology and Evolution; and she's listed as one of the authors. Do you understand what that article is? <br> A. Yes, I do generally. It's a publication in the Journal of Ecology and Evolution. <br> Q. And is this -- is she -- she authored it? <br> A. Yes. She's the first author; correct. <br> Q. And is this the post-doc work on Apalachicola Bay that you were referencing? <br> A. I would have to look at her -- when she credits. THE REPORTING GROUP | Q. Okay. And she lists a whole number of other sources of information. Correct? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. And we won't go through them all; but if you look at the back of her memo, there's a lot of charts and graphs on salinity and river flow and things like that attached. Do you see that, sir? <br> A. Yes, she has. <br> Q. Okay. Now, if we focus back on her summary section, there are -- the last two bullets were read to you. The second part concerns harvesting pressure, but do you see all the bullets above that have to do with low flow and the effects of low flow on the bay? <br> A. I do. <br> Q. And, sir, if you would turn to -- I'll just go right to the conclusion section, sir, which is on pages 7 and 8 of the memo. It's Bates 3824 and 25. Are you there, sir? <br> A. Yes, ma'am. <br> Q. So you read the paragraph that begins it is difficult to assess. Correct? <br> A. That's correct. <br> Q. Okay, sir. If we could, this will be the only thing I read in from this memo. Let's read the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
| Most of the time in academic journals, they will speak to how the funding was. But $I$ assume that it is part of her post-doc work. <br> Q. Thank you, sir. <br> If you turn back to the first page of her actual memo -- so not the e-mail in the front, but a few pages in there is the first page of the Petes memo at Bates ending 3818. Are you there, sir? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. And, again, just remind us of the timing of this. This was about two weeks after Governor Scott submitted his letter? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. Okay. So he submitted the letter along with the oyster assessment report, and then we get to the Petes memo. Correct? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. Okay. Now, she lists a number of resources in the top of her memo in that first paragraph just before the summary. And do you see that one of the things she lists is that FDACS report? <br> A. Yes, ma'am. <br> Q. And that is the 2012 oyster assessment report? <br> A. That's correct. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | paragraph that follows that begins however. <br> MS. WINE: Mr. Walton? <br> BY MS. WINE: <br> Q. It says, however, even the bars that have experienced relatively low harvesting pressure have exhibited oyster declines, indicating that drought is impacting the health, production, and recovery of the fishery. The fact that declines are occurring simultaneously across Franklin, Wakulla, Dixie and Levy Counties suggests widespread, landscape-scale impacts of reduced freshwater input. <br> Do you see that, sir? <br> A. Yes, ma'am. <br> Q. And it goes on to talk about the impacts of that reduced freshwater input on the oysters. Do you see that, sir? <br> A. I do. <br> Q. And what do you understand Ms. Petes to be saying in that paragraph of her conclusion? <br> A. It's saying that, first of all, where there's even low harvesting pressure, we're seeing oyster declines, and that it is a result of reduced freshwater input. And as we -- it is pretty complete within the literature that causes stress THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. I do. |  | parasitize oysters, and oysters are harmed. |
| 2 | Q. And, again, Mr. Havens was the -- is one of the | 2 | Do you see that, sir? |
| 3 | authors of the University of Florida situation |  | A. I do. |
| 4 | report? |  | Q. And, sir, is that consistent with the conclusions |
| 5 | A. He's the first listed. | 5 | of FWC? |
| 6 | Q. And does that have significance to you that he's |  | A. Yes, it is. |
| 7 | the first listed author? |  | Q. And is that consistent with the conclusions of |
| 8 | A. Traditionally, in academic publications, the |  | NOAA in declaring a disaster declaration? |
| 9 | first author is generally the prime author or |  | A. Yes, it is. |
| 10 | responsible author. | 10 | Q. And, sir, if we skip the next paragraph and go on |
| 11 | Q. And, sir, you were also shown a number of e-mails | 11 | to the bottom paragraph on the page, he says, |
| 12 | over the course of the last few days where | 12 | when the river flows were low, salinities |
| 13 | Mr. Havens was e-mailing with other University of | 13 | increased to levels similar to those found in the |
| 14 | Florida professors such as Mr. Pine. Is that | 14 | Gulf, and both predators and parasites of oysters |
| 15 | correct? | 15 | were abundant. Oysters were heavily infested |
| 16 | A. Correct. | 16 | with boring clams, sponges, and worms. And they |
| 17 | Q. And, sir, have you had a chance to review this | 17 | had a high level of internal parasites. What |
| 18 | testimony of Mr. Havens before Congress in | 18 | previously had been a place for oysters to thrive |
| 19 | connection with the disaster declaration request? | 19 | became a place for them to die. |
| 20 | A. I have. | 20 | Do you see that, sir? |
| 21 | Q. And if you could, sir, I direct your attention |  | A. I do. |
| 22 | just to the second paragraph there on the first | 22 | Q. And is that consistent with the conclusions that |
| 23 | page where he says he's there to provide | 23 | FWC reached? |
| 24 | information about water flow in the Apalachicola | 24 | A. Yes, it is. |
| 25 | River and the health of the Apalachicola Bay <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | Q. And is that conclusion -- that consistent with THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 1477 |  | 1479 |
| 1 | ecosystem. Do you see that? |  | the conclusions that NOAA reached? |
| 2 | It's right there in the second paragraph |  | A. It is. |
| 3 | after Senator Rubio and Nelson? |  | Q. Now, sir, let's go on to read the next paragraph. |
| 4 | A. Yes. Yes. I see that. | 4 | MR. ECHOLS: Your Honor, objection. |
| 5 | Q. Thank you, sir. | 5 | She's just reading another witness's |
| 6 | And then he goes on at the end of that page | 6 | testimony to him and asking if he can see |
| 7 | to talk about the droughts that have occurred in |  | and understand it. I think the Court can |
| 8 | 2011 and 2012. Do you see that, sir? | 8 | read this as well for itself, and it's not |
| 9 | A. I do. | 9 | really proper direct testimony. |
| 10 | Q. And he goes on in the next page, there is a | 10 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, why |
| 11 | heading titled, Now I will discuss impacts the | 11 | don't you suggest that he read it and then |
| 12 | recent low river flow on the bay. Do you see | 12 | ask your question. |
| 13 | that, sir? | 13 | MS. WINE: Sure thing, your Honor. |
| 14 | A. I do. | 14 | And this will be the last paragraph. |
| 15 | Q. And, sir, if we can read that first paragraph, he | 15 | MS. WINE: |
| 16 | testifies, when river enters into the bay, it | 16 | Q. Sir, if you could just read the paragraph that |
| 17 | dilutes the salt content to a lower level than | 17 | says, the data we examined, and read through to |
| 18 | occurs in the open waters of the Gulf of Mexico. | 18 | the end of that paragraph. |
| 19 | Oysters in the bay thrive, and grow in large | 19 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: To himself. |
| 20 | colonies called bars. Certain other animals, | 20 | BY MS. WINE: |
| 21 | including crabs, conchs, clams, worms, and | 21 | Q. To yourself. |
| 22 | sponges, which eat or damage oysters, are kept at | 22 | MS. WINE: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 23 | lower levels when there is good river flow. When | 23 | A. Okay. |
| 24 | river flow is greatly reduced, conditions in the | 24 | Q. Sir, is that paragraph consistent with the |
| 25 | bay become favorable to these things that eat and | 25 | conclusions of FWC? |
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A. It is.

```
Q. And in what way, sir?
A. In the -- the prime reasons for the crash and loss of oysters was related to high salinity, low river inflow, and predators and disease.
Q. And, sir, is it your understanding that that's consistent with the conclusion that NOAA reached as well?
```

A. It is.

MS. WINE: Your Honor, I'm about to move to another topic. I don't have very much left in my examination; but if this would be a good time for a lunch break, I could make sure that my last few questions are as efficient and quick as we can make them.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We'll take a break.

MS. WINE: Thank you, your Honor.
(Time Noted: 11:44 a.m.)
(Recess Called)
(Time Noted: 12:52 p.m.)
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Proceed, counsel.
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Sutton. I just have a few
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more questions.
Mr. Sutton, after the oyster collapse in
2012, what has been the focus of FWC management efforts?
A. Largely recovery and enforcing and putting forth regulatory options to try and recover population.
Q. And I believe you testified yesterday that there were two goals to FWC's efforts in this regard.

One you said was progressive management to allow recovery, and the second was to equally distribute oyster resources among harvesters. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall.
Q. And, sir, what are some of the things FWC has done post the crash either to assist in the recovery or facilitate the allocation of oyster resources among the harvesters?
A. I think the progression of the Executive Order lays out the regulatory approach. And I believe I testified that part of the beauty of the Executive Order is it allows you to react and respond and -- depending on the data. So we have been responsive in that regard.

And if you looked at the beginning of -- as in my testimony, the beginning of the harvest and THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the bag limits, and we're down now to three, from 20 to three, which is a serious reduction. And part of that calculation is to make sure that the fishermen out there are still able to at least maintain some sort of viability with equal distribution. So some of that calculation is based on that, which is typical in fisheries management.
Q. We saw in the Executive Order yesterday there was also some limits to harvesting days. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that part of the recovery goals?
A. That's correct.
Q. And check stations as well?
A. They are invoked at times, yes.
Q. And we also talked about reshelling today. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you were asked yesterday some questions about whether certain reefs in the bay were closed in order to assist recovery. Do you remember being asked those questions yesterday?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. And do you recall, first -- we don't THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
necessarily need to turn to it; but, first, you were shown an e-mail from Bill Pine to Nick Wiley where Bill Pine was suggesting why don't we close some of these reefs that were in recovery. Do you recall that e-mail?
A. I do.

MS. WINE: That was GX-589 just for the record.

BY MS. WINE:
Q. And then, if you would, sir, this is not in either binder; it's one of the loose documents you were given, GX-734. Can you find that, sir?
A. I will.
Q. It says GX-734 in the upper right corner; and it's a May 19, 2014, letter.
A. I'm having difficulty finding that right now.

MS. WINE: Do we happen to have another one marked?

Counsel, do you have -- this is one that you handed out. Do you have another copy?
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Well, sir, I'll just --

MS. WINE: If the Court doesn't mind, we're pulling it up.

Does the Court have it, or is it okay THE REPORTING GROUP


|  | 1488 |  | 1490 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | scan it. |  | Q. Okay. 2.78? |
| 2 | A. Yes. I don't see it in the Orders that follow. | 2 | A. Correct. |
| 3 | Q. And just so the record is entirely clear, on | 3 | Q. Okay. So then it's also still less than what was |
| 4 | Order 15-18, which is the second to last one you | 4 | harvested in 2011. Right? |
| 5 | mentioned, I believe it says East Hole is closed | 5 | A. Yeah. |
| 6 | except Mondays. So for that one period of time | 6 | Q. Do you notice in 1988 the amount harvested is |
| 7 | ere was very limited harvesting allowed on East | 7 | significantly lower, about 1.25 million? |
| 8 | Hole, correct, on Mondays? | 8 | A. I do. |
| 9 | A. That's correct. | 9 | Q. And do you have any idea why that happened? |
| 10 | Q. Okay. But, otherwise, it was closed during that period? | 10 | A. I'm not familiar with all of the variables that resulted in that. |
| 12 | A. Correct. | 12 | Q. I take it you're not aware then that after |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Sir, why in your view hasn't the bay | 13 | Hurricane Elena when there was this massive |
| 14 | recovered despite the restoration efforts that | 14 | recovery effort put in place with massive |
| 15 | FWC has undertaken since the crash? | 15 | reshelling and the like, that when they first |
| 16 | A. Well, as I have stated in my testimony, it's the | 16 | opened the bay back up to harvesting, they were |
| 17 | environmental conditions. It's the water | 17 | concerned that too many oysters were being |
| 18 | regime -- the salinity. Without that proper | 18 | harvested in 1987, and that that was what |
| 19 | balance, it's -- restoration can't happen. | 19 | arked FWC to institute a licensing requirement, |
| 20 | Q. Okay. Thank you, sir. | 20 | a check station requirement, and a seasons |
| 21 | MS. WINE: I have no further questions. | 21 | requirement. You don't -- you were not aware of |
| 22 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Recross? | 22 | that? |
| 23 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION | 23 | A. I recall reading that after Elena with the check |
| 24 | BY MR. ECHOLS: | 24 | ations, yes. |
| 25 | Q. Mr. Sutton, if I mixed up the dates, I apologize. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | Q. And, in fact, Mr. Berrigan wrote an entire THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 1489 |  | 1491 |
| 1 | But I have got on the screen right now the | 1 | ticle -- two articles about it because he |
| 2 | exhibit where we tried to track all of the Orders | 2 | udied it because there was a concern that the |
| 3 | that were entered. And I thought that I had run | 3 | pulation was going to crash after it had |
| 4 | through all of them with you, and maybe there was | 4 | recovered from too much harvesting. And so FWC |
| 5 | some confusion on my part. But I do have listed | 5 | put in place all of these limitations in order to |
| 6 | here -- it says May-June 1, 2014, an Executive | 6 | otect the resource so that it wouldn't |
| 7 | Order that was entered at that time. And to the | 7 | collapse. That generally accords with your |
| 8 | extent that I didn't identify it as East Hole as | 8 | ecollection? |
| 9 | part of that Order or connected to the Tommy Ward | 9 | A. I would certainly defer to Mr. Berrigan's |
| 10 | letter, then, you know, please accept my | 10 | recollection. |
| 11 | apologies. | 11 | Q. All right. Now, if we could go to the FWC |
| 12 | I want to go to, first -- if we can go back | 12 | report, which is which tab? |
| 13 | to my landings chart where we have the official | 13 | It's the JX-96. The final report, JX-96 |
| 14 | state data of all the oysters harvested from 1988 | 14 | behind tab 42 in your binder. |
| 15 | through 2015. Now, do you recall, sir, when | 15 | A. Okay. |
| 16 | Ms. Wine -- Ms. Wine had one, which I don't have | 16 | Q. And Ms. Wine referred you to page 52 in the |
| 17 | a copy of, where she drew in a bar that showed | 17 | pendices, which is the table listing the annual |
| 18 | 2.7 million pounds harvested in 1987. I don't | 18 | landings of pounds of oyster meat. I don't know |
| 19 | know if you have the one that she wrote on? | 19 | if you can flip back to find that. |
| 20 | A. I do. | 20 | A. That was the one that wasn't numbered. |
| 21 | Q. Okay. Now, just to be clear, first off, the 2.87 | 21 | Q. No. Actually, this one is numbered. It has a 52 |
| 22 | million, that's still less than was harvested in | 22 | on the bottom of it |
| 23 | 2012 of 3 million pounds there. Right? | 23 | A. I'm there, yes. |
| 24 | A. Yes. It's -- since you don't have this, it's | 24 | Q. And do you see, sir, that the pounds that are |
| 25 | 2.78 on her drawing. But -- | 25 | listed here for 2012 of what was harvested, |
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looks like it's got very poor substrate?
A. I'm sorry. I don't mean to be difficult. I just don't want to generalize beyond this image to say what a whole large oyster bar looks like.
Q. No, I know. I'm asking about this quadrat.
A. This quadrat, yes; I completely agree that it doesn't look like a good environment for oyster larvae to settle on.
Q. And you can see, if you look at what she pulled up in the mesh bags, we have got -- at the top right-hand side you have this little bit of gravel; and then at the bottom four quadrat samples, each of which has almost nothing in it. Right?
A. Yes. So we laid out long transects and took quadrat samples at every 5-meter increments. And it appears along that one transect of four quadrat samples there was not much reef structure.
Q. Now, one of the things that you conclude is that it was predation that killed the oysters that caused or is related to the collapse; is that correct?
A. My overall conclusion is that high salinity allowed natural enemies of oysters to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
proliferate. And these consist of multiple predator species, one of which is the drill. And they killed the adults and this causes recruitment failure. So that's my overall conclusion.
Q. When oyster drills kill the oysters, the shells are left behind; are they not?
A. Yes.
Q. So if there had been a predation event here with a lot of oysters killed by oyster drills, you would expect to see some shells; would you not?
A. It depends.
Q. Typically when the drills kill the oysters, the shell is left behind. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is January 2013, right in the height of what you are opining is the collapse caused by predation by oyster drills?
A. So I think what you're referring to is when a snail eats an oyster, the oyster dies; and there is no tissue or muscle left in it. But the shell still has two valves attached at the bottom. And so oystermen and DACS call that a box because it looks like an empty box.

And so a snail eats an oyster without causing THE REPORTING GROUP
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any damage. So after it eats it, it leaves
behind a box. And so in a perfect environment without any kind of disturbance, if you have a lot of snails eating a lot of oysters, you can see a lot of remnant boxes remaining. And that can be an indicator of snail predation.

However, in a environment like this with very strong currents and you do have tonging, storms, you can have physical factors that quickly cause the box to fall apart. And if that's the case, you just have two single shells laying on the ground. And at that point, the evidence of a box is destroyed.
Q. And in here though, we don't have either complete boxes or two single shells, apparent at least in this quadrat. And if there are some, not very many at all in these four different quadrat samples that were pulled up. Correct?
A. Yes. But that's not representative of -- it's a large bay.
Q. You -- you are telling me, are you, sir, that it would be improper to draw conclusions bay-wide from looking at a single oyster bar?
A. It depends on what kind of conclusion you're trying to draw.
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Q. I'm just picking up from what you said. You said this is not representative of the bay, that you shouldn't draw conclusions from a single bar that would be applicable to the entire bay.
A. Right. So -- and with regards to the number of boxes or the biomass of reef structure in an area, I would -- as I would teach my students, I would not generalize based on these screen shots. I would look at data, look at averages and variances, and make my conclusion based on that.
Q. No. And, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to be so limited to the screen shots.

But we had Mr. Berrigan here on Friday. And he was explaining to the Court and to us how each reef is basically its own individual ecosystem. And things can differ substantially from one reef to another depending upon the shell structure, depending upon where it is in the bay and salinity and the like. You would agree with that?
A. Absolutely.

MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, if he's going to ask Dr. Kimbro to opine on Mr. Berrigan's testimony, I would request that he show him the transcript rather than characterizing it, THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. It's 3 on the bottom, page 3 of the August 2012 DACS report.
A. Okay. Got it. Thank you.
Q. And if you wouldn't mind reading the second to last paragraph to yourself, the one that says Cat Point and East Hole Bar.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see the discussion of substrate being degraded?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that the pictures that we were looking at, recognizing that they're individual quadrat samples here and there, would be examples of degraded substrate that would not be good for spat settlement and recruitment?
A. I think I understand what you're asking me, but I think you -- you want me to establish a clear connection to those images and text written by someone other than me. So I can see right here there's a phrase that says, and the quality of the substrate is degraded. So, yes, I agree that's here in this paragraph.
Q. You know that this August 2012 report was written by Mr. Berrigan. Do you know that?
A. I think I have heard that. But at the time I THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
first saw this, I didn't know it because I don't think his name is on it.
Q. Right. But you have been working on this research for over three years now, and you were out on the boat on the water with Mr. Berrigan and Mr. Shields and Mr. Gunter. Correct?
A. Yes. But on a limited basis actually, just once.
Q. You know that Mr. Berrigan has been described and described himself as being the most knowledgeable person about the Apalachicola Bay oyster fishery for the last 30 years based on his work as the lead person in DACS?
A. I do know that.
Q. And -- but to the extent then that he -- and strike that.

And these DACS reports are official Florida state records. You're aware of that; are you not?
A. Yes.
Q. And in these official Florida state records, they're talking about the degraded quality of reef substrate and structure?
A. And I have no reason to doubt what that says in the document.
Q. And what you saw was degraded reef substrate and
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structure when you were down there?
A. When samples were brought up to me on the boat, I saw many -- or some samples that looked like a degraded reef, yes. I also saw many other samples that still had reef structure.
Q. Now, one of the reasons -- strike that.

One way that you can assist degraded reef structure is to engage in reshelling. Would you agree with me?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's an important restoration tool that's available to fisheries to help promote the recovery of an oyster population?
A. Yes.
Q. But as far as when you submitted your initial report, you hadn't analyzed any of the shelling data that Florida had done. Correct?
A. I had read about it and had seen it with my own eyes when I was out conducting my research, which is why when I was writing my expert report and I was introducing everything I knew about the system, I suggested that Florida's shelling efforts seemed to be aggressive, both because of what I read in a Florida state document as well as a Gulf states fishery management document. THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart

So given those official scientists and then what I saw with my own eyes, I felt comfortable describing it as, you know, a good effort in trying to reshell the habitat in Apalachicola Bay.
Q. But as of the time that you submitted your expert report in February of this year you hadn't analyzed any shelling data and had no idea of whatever shelling Florida was doing compared to prior periods. Right?
A. No. But I have since then. And my statistical analysis shows that before the collapse, we -the shelling effort by the State of Florida was not statistically different than in the long-term 30-year average of annual shelling effort conducted by the State. So with my own eyes and what I read and now I have statistically analyzed, I stand by that comment.
Q. Let me ask you about that statistical analysis. In your direct, you have got a chart on page 50 of your direct.
A. Is --
Q. Yes?
A. Is that in the -- can $I$ have a piece of paper form to look at that? THE REPORTING GROUP
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relatively stable. And then, again, based on our closer inspection at a higher resolution of the fishery-independent data, this level of harvesting did not inhibit recruitment just prior to the collapse.
Q. In fact, if I can refer you -- and let's keep this up on the screen there -- to your written direct testimony, paragraph 99.
A. Sorry. My direct testimony?
Q. Yes, please, sir, your direct testimony to paragraph 99 on page 40.

Are you at paragraph 99 ?
A. Yes. I was just beginning to --
Q. Okay. Sure.
A. -- read it.

## Should I read it?

MR. ECHOLS: Just waiting for the Court
to -- got it, sir?
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Yes. We were operating under a rule where we don't read things, at least I don't. But could you read the first sentence only of that paragraph out loud.
A. The results of the model demonstrated that the commercial harvest of oysters has not changed THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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significantly over the past $\mathbf{3 0}$ years.
And --
Q. Okay.
A. -- if I could revise that, $I$ would revise it to be the estimated fishing rate.
Q. Okay. And the commercial harvest of oysters has changed significantly over the past 30 years, as reflected by the harvest data. Correct?
A. Again, when you -- you're just seeing an image here; and you're using your eyes and your mind to say what's different and what's not. And in our field, we use statistics. And in order to use statistics, you have to have averages and variances.

So the way you're looking at these data right here, the human mind wants to see patterns. But in order to objectively see if there are differences or not, you need to use means and variances. And so when you do that, like the model output did, it shows that the level of fishing has been relatively consistent for the past 20 years.
Q. In your binder, if I could ask you to turn, please, to tab 6. And this is GX-1318. And we're only going to look at a very tiny part of THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
this. This is an article published --peer-reviewed article that you cite in your expert report bibliography. And I take it you're familiar with this article?
A. Yes. And, in fact, as a post-doc, I tried to work with Dr. Kirby to write a proposal for the National Science Foundation.
Q. And in very laymen terms, what Dr. Kirby is studying is how oyster fisheries have declined and in some cases been destroyed up and down the coast in progression over time over the past hundred-some years?
A. Yes. He's using essentially fishery-dependent data landings and historical records to piece together a very plausible story about how oyster reefs declined going from north to south.
Q. And this is awful hard to read given the way the columns are set up. I'll direct you over, but I'll have it pulled out. I'll direct you on the right-hand column, and it's two-thirds of the way down there is a section where he starts third. He's doing first, second, and third. The line that begins early 1800's.
A. I see that.
Q. Okay.
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MR. ECHOLS: And can we put up, you know, that particular portion on our chart, please.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And so what, as you explained, Dr. Kirby was looking at was Dr. Kirby, whom you wanted to do some research with, was looking at how you could examine landings data to identify fishery collapses, shall we say, and explains that what you would find that would show a fishery collapse would be where the landings data would show a rapid rise to a maximum value followed by a rapid decrease and that such a rise to a maximum value like this serves as an equally and easily recognizable proxy for a fishery collapse and reef degradation. Right?
A. Yes. And that's why, when I looked at these data, my initial hypothesis was that fishing pressure played a role in the collapse of 2012 in Apalachicola.
Q. Okay. Last thing I would like to touch on, please, sir, is the model that you and Dr. White worked on was designed to assist the Court in determining whether the low flows from the river caused the oyster collapse. Does that more or THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## less sound accurate?

A. Yes. We wanted to evaluate the relative roles of fishing pressure and very high salinity level induced by low river flows.
Q. And when we had your initial report, you had -you and Dr. White had run a scenario that assumed that Georgia was consuming no water whatsoever, you know, and analyzed whether that would have had an impact on the biomass or abundance of oysters. Is that right?
A. We did run that scenario.
Q. But then since then, you know, up until now through your direct testimony, you and Dr. White also ran what is called a remedy scenario, which uses what Florida is proposing be imposed on Georgia as far as restrictions on their water use. Is that right?
A. We were asked to run a scenario as you described.
Q. And I just want to look at what the results of the model that you and Dr. White did. And you did fix those parameters, the ones that were wrong, the small size and the growth rate?
A. Just for the record, they weren't wrong at the time. But we just had better data that we could use at a later date.
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Q. You changed them. They were double when it was rerun later on. Right?
A. Given our more expansive and very intensive experiment, we then had much higher quality data. And we would rather use those data than the data that we had -- that's all we had when we first started the sturdy.
Q. If you could look at Dr. White's written direct testimony where he charts the results of the model and the effect of the remedy scenario, and that would be on page 50 of Dr. White's written direct. Are you there, sir?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And do you see the same chart that we have up on the screen. And I'm focused on the Cat Point one.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this remedy scenario that is proposed here, you understand that it anticipates that half of Georgia's agricultural consumption of water would be cut?
A. I didn't understand that. I was just given a salinity time series and was told to run it. And I knew it was less of an imposition, for lack of a better word, on the State of Georgia than was THE REPORTING GROUP
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the "Georgia can't use any water" scenario.
Q. And so under this remedy scenario, the way the Court should understand the chart is that if you cut, assuming that is what is intended here, one-half of all of Georgia's agricultural consumption, based on the model that you and Dr. White put together, that remedy scenario shows that you would have somewhere in between a zero and a 1.1 percent difference as far as greater oyster abundance. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And your conclusion is that despite the fact that if you put in place this significant restriction on Georgia water use, that based on all of your modeling and observation and experimentation, that the 1 to 1.2 percent difference that you would have in the change in population shows that Georgia water use caused the oyster collapse?
A. Yes.

Is there any way I could look at a map and --
Q. I'm sure Mr. --
A. -- to answer the question?
Q. Mr. Qureshi will lead you through that.

That's correct; your opinion is that Georgia water consumption caused the oyster collapse? THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. The reason why I wanted to look at a map is to say -- well, one, the model was set up in a very, very conservative process. We are looking at Cat Point commercial bar, the most heavily-fished bar. So the model is estimating fishing rate in an area of the bay where it's being fished the most. It's not happening everywhere. At the same time we're at an oyster bar that's farther away from the river than are other bars.

So our results here are very, very conservative in showing the benefit of any additional flow from the river on the population abundance at this commercial bar far from the river.

So, unfortunately, we don't have data for bars closer to the river. And as you move in towards the river, you're going to see, given the same scenario, much more pronounced benefit to the oyster populations.

And during times of natural stress, oyster reefs far away from the river generally decline precipitously. What is needed in estuaries for those bars close to the river to be maintained is freshwater inflow driving out predators and disease. So when the conditions normalize, the THE REPORTING GROUP
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into adult legal-size oysters for harvest.
They then, due to some modeling efforts, concluded that the current regulation on the legal size limit to harvest oysters at 3 inches was sufficient to prevent the likelihood of overharvesting the resource. However, they cautioned that everyone needed to stick to obeying that regulation.

And, finally, they share with the public that they had investigated in oysters, two different shrimp species, and crabs whether or not dispersant used during the Deepwater Horizon oil spill was in any way in the food web in the bay and might play a factor in the collapse of oysters in 2012. And they, based on their evidence, concluded that it was not a factor.
Q. Dr. Kimbro, on page 7 under the Results section, the first substantive topic is environmental conditions. Why did the task force look at environmental conditions in its work?
A. This was research conducted by, if $I$ remember, Dr. Bill Pine and Dr. Karl Havens, both at the University of Florida. And I think the overall goal of this section was to show just how different the environmental conditions in THE REPORTING GROUP
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Apalachicola Bay and the River were just prior to the collapse when compared to long-term trends from 1950 to 2000.

So the first figure on page 7, figure 1, is showing you how recent years of flow from the Apalachicola River compared to long-term averages and variances of flow from 1950 to 2006, I believe, for each of the $\mathbf{1 2}$ months of the year.
Q. Dr. Kimbro, excuse me for interrupting. Are you on figure 1 or figure 2?
A. Figure 1, talking about flow.
Q. Okay.
A. But -- in short, the most recent years were considerably below the long-term average of flow from the river.
Q. And what impact does that have on the health of the estuary?
A. Well, salinity is the primary organizational environmental force of how species and food webs assemble themselves throughout an estuary. If you ever go fishing in an estuary, if you go closer to the river, you're going to catch different fishes and species than you are farther away from the river. That's because you're going to have species more adapted to marine conditions THE REPORTING GROUP
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far away from the river and species better adapted for freshwater conditions closer to the river. So salinity essentially organizes what your food web looks like throughout an estuary.

And, for example, oysters for a long time have enjoyed the benefits of living close to rivers because their predators and diseases can't take that. So when you have flow events, it beats back the disease and predators, which oysters, I assume, appreciate.
Q. And what impacts does fresh water have on nutrients?
A. So fresh water from the river organizes estuarine systems in two ways. The first is the salinity, which we just talked about. The second is food webs, whether on land or at sea, the base of them are supported by plants or autotrophs. And these things grow their food on limited nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus. So without that, the plants can't grow. Without plants, you can't have herbivores. Without herbivores, you can't have carnivores. So in estuaries, the primary delivery of limited nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorus come from rivers.

So when you turn off the flow of the river, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
any river, that's dumping into an estuary, you're significantly altering the food web of the estuary in two ways. One, by increasing the salinity, you're increasing natural enemies of things like oysters that then come and make them die. So that's, like, a top-down pressure.

And then, No. 2, because you're starving the system of limited nutrients that the plants -- in marine systems the plants are algae. And that's what the oysters filter out of the water for food. You're then starving the oysters. So you're collapsing the food web from the bottom as well.

So lacking river water fundamentally changes the food webs of the estuaries from the top down and from the bottom up.
Q. On page 10 , sir, there's a discussion by the task force on status and trends in the oyster fishery.

Can you explain why the task force was looking at the fishery?
A. I'm sorry. Can you tell me which page that is on again, please?
Q. I believe it's page 10 , sir.
A. And your question was what is this section about?
Q. It was more general. Why was the task force THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

|  | 1580 |  | 1582 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | looking at the oyster fishery? | 1 | population. There are going to be more younger |
| 2 | A. One, they wanted to explain to the public the | 2 | individuals than older individuals, so that |
| 3 | kinds of data they have available to evaluate | 3 | doesn't surprise me. But what you also see is |
| 4 | what's going on with the fishery. So they | 4 | over the past 22 years, there's been tremendous |
| 5 | presented two different kinds of data that -- | 5 | variability, peaks and valleys, of the abundance |
| 6 | again, I'm not a fisheries biologist, but what I | 6 | of sub-legal oysters that they were quantifying. |
| 7 | believe fisheries biologists use. And the first | 7 | However, in 2011 there was a very high |
| 8 | was fishery-dependent data. And that essentially | 8 | abundance of sub-legal oysters, indicating that |
| 9 | is the amount of landings or oyster pounds | 9 | harvest the following year should be very good. |
| 10 | brought to the dock. Typically on an annual | 10 | But what they found in $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ was there was a |
| 11 | basis, they use the total. And from that they | 11 | precipitous drop-off in the abundance of these |
| 12 | can calculate how landings fluctuate over time. | 12 | sub-legal oysters, most likely due to a massive |
| 13 | The second type of data that they want to | 13 | mortality event. |
| 14 | introduce the public to that they use to evaluate | 14 | Q. Dr. Kimbro, there's been discussion about harvest |
| 15 | what's going on with the fishery are the | 15 | of oysters that are smaller than 3 inches. As an |
| 16 | fishery-independent data. So these are data | 16 | oyster ecologist and biologist, what's the impact |
| 17 | collected by DACS, a division within the State of | 17 | on the oyster resource of harvesting oysters |
| 18 | Florida, that went out and dove to the bottom on | 18 | smaller than 3 inches? |
| 19 | reefs. And instead of relying on harvesters to | 19 | A. Well, the 3-inch threshold for harvesting an |
| 20 | tell them, you know, how many oysters are out | 20 | oyster is a conservative threshold set by federal |
| 21 | there, they went down and actually grabbed | 21 | or state management scientists; but it doesn't |
| 22 | samples per unit area, brought them up to the | 22 | reflect the true biology of the organism. If I |
| 23 | boat, and counted the number of oysters. And | 23 | went out and we all harvested oysters that were 2 |
| 24 | they also sized the oysters so you could tell how | 24 | inches, 2-3/4 inches, that wouldn't inhibit |
| 25 | many oysters were of market size to be harvested <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | reproductive capability of the oyster population <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 1581 |  | 1583 |
| 1 | and how many oysters are just below that so, | 1 | because oysters -- they're actually |
| 2 | therefore, are going to quickly grow into market | 2 | hermaphrodites. So at $\mathbf{1}$ inch in size, the males |
| 3 | size. And they could then use that to plan | 3 | egin producing many, many sperm that are |
| 4 | future harvesting regulations for the next | 4 | released. Once the oysters get a little older, |
| 5 | season. | 5 | they switch to female; and they're larger. And |
| 6 | Q. Sir, if we could look at figure 14 on the bottom | 6 | the average-size female oyster can release 8 |
| 7 | of page 13, the lower right-hand corner. Can you | 7 | million eggs. |
| 8 | explain what that means? | 8 | So 1 find it hard to believe that if we |
| 9 | A. Figure 14, the bottom panel? | 9 | harvest at $\mathbf{2}$ inch, 2-3/4 inches for our oyster |
| 10 | Q. Yes, sir. | 10 | population, that we're going to somehow inhibit |
| 11 | A. Okay. These are -- this is a plot of the | 11 | the reproductive success of an oyster population. |
| 12 | fishery-independent data. And it shows you on | 12 | Q. Dr. Kimbro, on page 23 of the task force report |
| 13 | the $\mathbf{Y}$ axis the number of oyster individuals per | 13 | there's a discussion of monitoring and |
| 14 | meter squared. So that's size of the quadrat | 14 | experimentation. Can you describe that section |
| 15 | they used to collect their animals. | 15 | for us? |
| 16 | And the red data at the bottom shows you for | 16 | A. Yes. |
| 17 | each year from 1990, going from left to right, to | 17 | THE WITNESS: Could I use a map to -- |
| 18 | 2012 the abundance of adult legal-size oysters in | 18 | your Honor, to explain this? |
| 19 | these quadrats. And it was relatively stable. | 19 | This is a section I wrote; and it will |
| 20 | You don't see too many wild fluctuations in that. | 20 | be wordy, but easier to do if I can point at |
| 21 | If you then look at the blue data on the line | 21 | things. |
| 22 | just above it, one, you're going to notice that | 22 | Thank you. |
| 23 | these are the sub-legal oysters. So they're | 23 | BY MR. QURESHI: |
| 24 | smaller. And there are many more of them. And | 24 | Q. Sure. I'll put a map up for you and give you a |
| 25 | that's what you expect to find in any natural | 25 | laser pointer. |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
|  | Mason \& Lockhart |  | Mason \& Lockhart |



and Dr. Bill Pine at the University of Florida, as well as Dr. Carl Walters, who is a retired fisheries biologist from the University of British Columbia, as well as a student of Dr. Pine's, Ed Camp. In addition to evaluating the fishery-dependent and independent data, they constructed a model. It was actually Dr. Walter's model; he created it and drove it. And they had four key conclusions that are important to share with the Court.

The first is just as we have all seen looking at the fishery-dependent and independent data, there was an unprecedented decline of oysters in 2012. They said the possible reasons for that collapse was a recruitment failure and/or a massive mortality of sub-legal oysters.

Second, the actual output from their model suggested that mortality of oysters was increasing; but because they lacked the necessary data, i.e., the kind of data that my research program has developed, they could not explain exactly why mortality was increasing. They did lay out hypotheses about the influence of low river flow, higher salinity, and its influence on the diseases and predators of oysters. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Third, they highlighted that the
fishery-independent dataset indicated by 2012, the oyster situation did not look good. As a result, it could not sustain substantial harvesting further. And they highlighted the fact that FWC had significantly restricted harvest as guided by this task force.

And fourth is an important one, so I'll quote it. Fourth, there is no evidence that harvest of sub-legal oysters has or would lead to overfishing. If current regulations are followed, it is unlikely that the current with sub-legal oysters and the catch has caused the trends we see in the data unless the sub-legal harvest has been unregulated and extremely high.

And I just want to add that this was done completely independent of me on the task force. I don't agree with their methods, but their results point in the very same direction that my research program does.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Kimbro.

Before we leave this document, can you describe the relationship between the task force and the Florida state agencies involved at DACS FWC?
A. You couldn't ask for a better relationship. I was pretty young. I had never worked with state scientists. So I suspected that they wouldn't appreciate academics coming in and asking to see their books requesting data. But that was the completely opposite of what I saw.

For example, Dr. Pine requested persistently updated landings data, fishery-independent data. By following e-mail chains, I was able to discern that FWC employees were working overtime to get him these data.

From my own experience, I wanted a different version of the fishery-independent data that the task force did not have. So I simply got in my car, drove from the FSU marine lab 20 minutes to the FDACS office, knocked on the door unannounced; and they invited me right in. I told them what I needed. And it was as simple as me sticking my disk drive into their computer. And five minutes later I was walking out of their office with a 30-year time series.

So the point I'm trying to make is they were very open. It was a harmonious relationship between state scientists and academics. And you couldn't hope for anything better when you're THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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working on a complex issue like this.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Kimbro.

I want to move on to a slightly different topic now. You had mentioned some of the prior studies evaluating the relationship between salinity and the oyster resource. You mentioned, I believe, Dr. Petes. Who is Dr. Petes?
A. Dr. Petes received her Ph.D. from Morgan State University under a very famous ecologist, Dr. Jane Lubchenco. She then did a post-doc with me at Florida State University. When I became a faculty there, she moved to work for NOAA, the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, in their climate program office.

Given her -- she actually studied in 2007 and ' 8 one of the serious droughts in Apalachicola. She studied the relationship between increasing water salinity due to lack of water flow in the river and the incidence and intensity of a disease called dermo and its effect on oyster mortality.

So given that proven track record, the Undersecretary of Commerce, Dr. Jane Lubchenco, who was hand-picked by the president of the United States, she asked Dr. Petes to investigate THE REPORTING GROUP
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the issue when they were notified by the State of Florida about the problem in 2012.

MR. QURESHI: Your Honor, may I approach
Dr. Kimbro?
BY MR. QURESHI:
Q. Dr. Kimbro, I have handed you a document that's identified as Florida Exhibit 412. It's actually three documents stapled together. I'll give you a moment to flip through it.
A. I'm familiar with the document.
Q. Okay. Can you please describe it?
A. It appears to be an e-mail correspondence between Dr. Petes and perhaps her supervisor. Dr. Petes being notified that she's been appointed by Dr. Lubchenco, the Undersecretary for the Department of Commerce Oceanic Atmosphere. And it appears that she's accepted that task.

And then there's another e-mail in which she is reporting her conclusions on the situation surrounding the 2012 oyster decline in Apalachicola Bay and is then asking if she can be of any further assistance.
Q. The document where she lays out her conclusions, is that signified by the Bates numbers on the lower right-hand corner, NOAA-0003818 through THE REPORTING GROUP
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3841?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. How are the conclusions in this memo consistent with your work?
A. In short, very consistent.
Q. Can you explain how?
A. My understanding is she lays out the fact that there was significant drought naturally stressing the oyster populations, much as my research approach analogies. And she, of course, attributes that to low flow from the Apalachicola River. During these kinds of conditions, natural enemies of oysters proliferate such as disease and multiple species of predators. So these were restricting the population of the oyster.

She also talks about harvesting pressure was ongoing at the same time. However, she concludes due to stressful conditions associated with the severity and duration of the recent drought, it is likely that high Florida Gulf Coast oyster mortality would be occurring even in the absence of harvesting pressure, so said a scientist for the -- NOAA.
Q. On page 4 of this memo, sir, there is a discussion about drought and flooding in the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Suwannee River. I would like to understand from you whether the 2012 collapse in Apalachicola Bay was an issue that was broader in scope? Were there other areas of Florida that were impacted?
A. That's a great question. And it was specifically incorporated by my research approach, which I not only focused on Apalachicola, but to be able to answer questions like that $I$ ran the same kind of observations and experiments in other estuaries.

So the principle is if you see the same outcomes from your studies in other estuaries that you're seeing in Apalachicola, then that would indicate there's a regional-scale stressor causing everything. If, however, you see intensification of things in Apalachicola Bay that you don't see elsewhere, then that would suggest that there's something additional that's unique to Apalachicola that is going on beyond natural environmental stress to cause what we saw in 2012.

And so one sort of nonscientific hard data observation was in the e-mail about the gravel parking lot. I think if we read that further, we would see that Dr. Pine and I were communicating about what we were seeing. He was operating -THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. If I could just pause you, Dr. Kimbro, so we can catch up.
A. Sure.
Q. I'm going to put that e-mail up. I believe it's GX-486, and it should be tab 5 of the binder that was provided to you by Georgia's counsel.

If you could just direct us to the section you were referring to, and then we'll follow along.

I believe you sent an e-mail to Dr. Pine at 9:47 p.m. on Thursday, October 25, 2012?
A. So in this e-mail chain we're comparing notes essentially of what I'm seeing in Apalachicola Bay and what Dr. Pine was seeing in Cedar Key, an estuary a five-hour drive south of Apalachicola Bay. We recognized that there were stressors on the oyster populations in both areas; but I asked him, after making the gravel parking lot comment, you know, that I was seeing in other areas of Apalachicola Bay symptoms of an outbreak of predatory snails eating all the oysters caused by very high salinity, if he saw anything similar in Cedar Key. So if he did, that would suggest that there is a very regional stress causing the same thing in all estuaries of the Gulf Coast. And he THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


You also have many researchers in Delaware Bay showing very strong relationships between water salinity, as it increases, predictably you see an increasing effect of dermo disease on oysters. And that can have a devastating impact on oyster populations.

You also see NOAA document studies as well as studies out of Texas that show salinity is the primary determinant of where oysters can occur. So at a certain point if the water is too salty, you no longer have oyster reefs. And these are in publication cited, in fact, by the expert witness from the State of Georgia.

You also have geological evidence published in a geological journal in $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ that shows oysters came into a Texas estuary about $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 0 0}$ years ago. And there have been massive droughts from now until then. And those droughts are associated with massive, massive losses of oyster reef habitat in that bay.

So these are my observations, my experiments in Apalachicola Bay, others' independent research efforts in Apalachicola Bay, other independent research efforts in other estuaries.

And now, let's go to the landings data. Can THE REPORTING GROUP
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salinity cause massive declines in oyster landings?

So if you look at datasets requested from the National Marine Fisheries Service, you can get landings data for all the Gulf states going back to the 1950's. So you can see in the early ' 50 's, there was a massive drought; and that resulted in a massive collapse of oyster landings, greater than what we saw in Apalachicola. You can see similar associations between severe droughts and significant drops, more than 50 percent, in oyster landings in other states of Mississippi and Alabama in the '60's.

Going back to Texas, the Texas legislature passed legislation in 1985 so that fresh water from the rivers would not be impeded so that all that water could flow as it naturally does to the estuaries to prevent problems that happened with coastal species when you deprive estuaries of fresh water. Since then, they haven't had these dramatic problems.

Now, in fact, going to the Chesapeake Bay, you can see in 1987-1988, there's a very significant drought. And researchers, in fact, from the Virginia Institute of Marine Science has THE REPORTING GROUP
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published a scientific study that showed the very clear relationship in oysters outdoors. With high salinity conditions, you have high dermo disease that caused massive losses of oysters and significant decline in the oyster fishery.

The same conclusion and thing happened in a severe drought in 2001 and 2002 in Chesapeake Bay where researchers again found the exact same pattern. And this was provided by data from the Maryland Department of Marine Science, I believe.

So if we go from my work conducted in Apalachicola, other work conducted in Apalachicola, scientific studies from the geological record to ecological studies in other estuaries, and then looking at the landings data and drought data in other estuaries, I can definitively say that when you have very high salinity conditions due to lack of flow of river, you're going to have bad things happen to oysters, just like we saw in 2012 in Apalachicola Bay.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Kimbro.

On the binder that was provided to you by Georgia's counsel, they reviewed with you the article by Kirby behind tab 6. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. Okay.
Q. Sir, are you familiar with this article?
A. I am. I haven't read it in awhile.
Q. Okay. Just very generally, what does this article provide about the cause and effect relationships for a fishery collapsing?
A. It doesn't. It provides strong observational data on what could have caused the collapse. It's convincing, but I would be reticent to apply that thinking in particular to Apalachicola because all the estuaries that this study focused on allowed harvesters to use very efficient methods such as dredging. In contrast, the State of Florida and Apalachicola does not allow dredging on public oyster bars. You have to use very large tongs. They're 12 feet tall, very heavy wooden salad spoons basically.

And I tried to tong oysters from a very unsteady boat. If you ever see an oysterman tonging oysters, they're on these very, very small boats. They're rocking back and forth. So when you're standing on the bow and you're moving all around by the waves and you have these very large, 12-foot tall, two rakes put together like a salad spoon, it's very difficult to grab THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
sections of the reef and bring it back up to the boat.

So that's a much more inefficient harvesting practice than what you saw in the areas that Dr. Kirby talked about where all the collapses occurred.

Not only is the actual process less efficient, the tonging, only a few people can do that. Not anyone off the street can just walk in there and get on a boat and go tong efficiently a bunch of oysters. If you look at these gentlemen out on their boats harvesting out in Apalachicola Bay, they're strong; and they're very skilled and not -- the fishery has a relatively small number of individuals. So it's not a job just anyone else can do.

And finally, the tongs are set up so that when you grab a section of the reef, smaller oysters and material can fall through the teeth of the tong. Again, trying to make it so that they're only extracting the adult oysters. So it's a very inefficient process.

Given that, I would be reticent to apply the conclusions made on estuaries in the mid and north Atlantic to what's going on in Apalachicola THE REPORTING GROUP
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Bay.
Q. On figure 1 of the Kirby article, there's a reference to Apalachicola Bay signified by the number 13. How do you interpret that figure?
A. That peak in landings occurred much later than in other estuaries. So it hasn't been harvested as long as other estuaries.
Q. And, Dr. Kimbro, behind tab 7 and 8 of that same binder there's two publications by Dr. Pine. Do you know Dr. Pine?
A. I do.
Q. Are you familiar with these particular publications behind tab 7 and 8 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your assessment of those publications?
A. The first is that I don't agree with their methods. But they -- and as a result, they actually admit themselves that they can't really conclude that much. But the things that they do conclude are in the same -- point in the same direction as my research program. So that's convenient.

And in particular, they essentially say they have no evidence that harvesting effort caused THE REPORTING GROUP
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the collapse in 2012. The other -- that's an important conclusion.

The other important component of this paper is that one of the main things we're talking about here today is how extraction of fresh water from the Apalachicola River may have impacted what happened in 2012. And they admit in the beginning of this article they did not even address that. So I find it hard to accept any conclusions from the study about what happened in 2012 if they did not even evaluate the most proximal potential cause for it happening in 2012.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Dr. Kimbro.

MR. QURESHI: I have nothing further.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, are you
able to give me an estimate of how much longer?
MR. ECHOLS: Would 7 to 10 minutes be okay, Judge, or no?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Seven to 10, okay. The clock is ticking.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Dr. Kimbro, you still have the Apalachicola Bay oyster situation report in front of you -THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Yes.
Q. -- GX-568?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And do you -- you were referred to page 15 and the portion which you read verbatim that there was a conclusion of not being evidence that harvest of sub-legal oysters could be the cause unless it had been unregulated and extremely high. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the course of you preparing your expert report and in the course of the testimony today, you know, we have seen a large number of state official documents like JX-50. Do you still have that one in front of you, the August 2011 oyster resource --
A. Is there a tab that you can point me to, please?
Q. No. I handed that one up to you loose in the

Sutton tab. And the Court has seen it before, so I would expect that -- JX-50.
A. I found it.
Q. Okay. On -- this will take two seconds. On page 6 we have seen this numerous times, unregulated and extremely high, the State of Florida -- if you are at the top of page 6, if THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. I would need to read it again before $I$ commented on it.
Q. Okay. Go ahead and take a look at that paragraph, please.
A. Okay. I read it.
Q. The report said, unregulated, the State of Florida says that there was less effort directed toward enforcing size limits. The Sea Grant report said that if it were extremely high, that perhaps that sub-legal harvest could impact a collapse. The State of Florida says there were numerous reports and that the harvest of small oysters was very common. Would you agree with me?
A. Sure. But that's a hard thing to really analyze and use in a scientific method.

In contrast, our research program with our very good model, if there was ravage harvesting of sub-legal oysters, we would have seen an uptick in the fishing rate in the output of that model. So these are sort of not really data that you can do any kind of valid scientific statistical analysis on or include into a model. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

So I recognize this is good information; and, in fact, $I$ use it to define my hypotheses. Again, I came into this actually thinking fishing pressure was the bigger cause.
Q. And it's correct, is it not, that the oyster Sea Grant report, Dr. Havens, Dr. Pine, both are well-respected scientists with experience and knowledge and writings on fisheries and oysters. Right?
A. No.
Q. No?

Dr. Havens and Dr. Pine --
A. Not --
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Dr. Havens and Dr. Pine, they're not well respected?
A. They're well respected, but they have no experience with oyster reefs.
Q. Okay. And your testimony is that the only way that this causal determination can properly be made is through the appropriate data that came from your research with the three-part methodology?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that was what you have determined, you know, in the course of preparing your expert analysis in this case? You reached that conclusion this year more or less?
A. I reached it by the time of the expert report. And then with continued data coming in, the conclusion -- I was even more confident in what I concluded from my expert report. And as we continue to study it, I think it's going to become even stronger.
Q. And so, for example, when the Fish and Wildlife -- the Florida Fish and Wildlife submitted its report to the federal government in August 2013, they didn't have available to them the State of Florida appropriate data to reach a valid conclusion about the causes of the oyster collapse?
A. I wasn't part of the State of Florida when that --
Q. Right.
A. Nor am I now.
Q. But that data didn't exist until you did your experiments. Nobody in the world had the appropriate data to come to a reliable scientific conclusion about the collapse until you did your THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart research?
A. Well, my job was to design and conduct my research. And I used the FWC statements as motivation for conducting my study. But I did not evaluate how FWC went about making their decisions and conclusions.
Q. Last thing, do you still have FX-412 with you up there, please, sir?

That's the Laura -- Dr. Laura Petes -- Petes?
A. Petes.
Q. Petes, okay. I screwed up the pronunciation regardless. Everybody calls me Barack, but it's Barack.
A. People call me Dave; I'm David.
Q. You were talking about how qualified she was; she's appointed by the Undersecretary of the Department of Commerce, and how her research and conclusions accord with yours. Correct?
A. Independently.
Q. Yes, independently. Let's look at her conclusion, and this will be the last thing.
A. Sorry. Are we on the ecology and evolution paper or some other document?
Q. It's on page 7, please, of the official memo she did for NOAA in that FX-412 in the section called THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

| \$ | 1420:6, 1465:21, | 15-22 [1] - 1487:24 | 1473:25, 1474:3, | 2010-2011 [1]-1563:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$10,000 [1] - 1508:7 | 1530:22, 1577:8, $1607: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1503_{[1]}-1365: 4 \\ & 1504_{[1]}-1365: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1486:19, 1487:3, } \\ & \text { 1487:4, 1496:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2011 \text { [29] - 1378:4, } \\ \text { 1378:8, 1385:18, } \end{gathered}$ |
| \$109,375 [1] - 1380:8 | 12-foot [1] - 1607:24 | 1506 [1] - 1365:15 | 1530:19, 1543:5, | 1391:22, 1392:1, |
| \$110,000 [4] - | 12:52 [1] - 1480:21 | 1519 [1] - 1365:9 | 1554:3, 1554:14, | 1393:8, 1415:10, |
| 1380:10, 1380:24, | 13 [6]-1413:22, | 1532 [1]-1365:14 | 1555:5, 1577:10, | 1432:12, 1462:23, |
| 1381:4, 1381:10 | 1443:20, 1463:25, | 1549 [1] - 1365:14 | 1579:7, 1582:23, | 1464:7, 1465:13, |
| \$70 [1] - 1382:24 | 1486:21, 1581:7, | 1565 [1] - 1365:24 | 1583:9, 1586:5, | 1477:8, 1490:4, |
| \$80 [1] - 1382:16 | 1609:4 | 1572 [1] - 1365:4 | 1590:23 | 1492:22, 1493:17, |
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| stressing [1] - 1597:8 <br> stressor [1] - 1598:13 | 1452:22, 1575:19, 1575:22, 1581:23, | substrate [19] - | $\begin{aligned} & 1428: 13,1428: 22 \\ & 1435: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 1485:23 |
| stressor [1]-15 <br> stressors [1] | 1582:6, 1582:8, | 1374:25, 1375:7, | supported [3] - | 1415:13, 1452:12, |
| 1599:16 | 1582:12, 1592:16, | 1509:21, 1510:3, | 1529:10, 1535:16, | 1452:15, 1501:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { stretch [2]-1393:16, } \\ & 1433: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1593:10, 1593:13, } \\ & \text { 1593:14, 1611:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1510: 8,1511: 12, \\ & 1512: 1,1517: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 1578:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1522:22, 1573:20, } \\ & \text { 1579:8, 1584:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1433:20 | $1612: 12,1612: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1512: 1,1517: 24, \\ & 1518: 17,1520: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supporting [1] - } \\ & \text { 1396:21 } \end{aligned}$ | 1579:8, 1584:3 |
| 1522:6, 1558:1 | sub-legal [16] - | 1520:14, 1520:21, | supposed [4] - | 1543:20, 1586:25 |
| string [2] - 1413:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1373:6, 1432:7, } \\ & \text { 1432:9, 1440:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1521:22, 1521:25, } \\ & 1526: 3,1555: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 1390:23, 1422:17, <br> 1546.5, 1549.21 | systems [2] - 1578:14, |
| 1414:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 1432: 9,1440: 12, \\ & 1452: 22,1581: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 1526:3, 1555:3, 1563:20 | 1546:5, 1549:21 <br> SUPREME [1] - |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { strong }[7]-1514: 8, \\ 1563: 19.1586: 9 \end{array}$ | 1582:6, 1582:8, | subtract [1] - 1586:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SUPREME [1] - } \\ & \text { 1364:1 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1563:19, 1586:9, | 1582:12, 1592:16, | subtraction [1] - | $136$ |  |
| 1607:7, 1608:13 | 1593:10, 1593:13, | 1586:14 | $1517: 24,1531: 10$ | tab [72] - 1367:1, |
| stronger [1] - 1614:10 | 1593:14, 1611:7, | succeeded [1] - | surprise [2] - 1559:15, | 1367:4, 1367:6, $1367: 7.1367: 8 .$ |
| strongly [1] - 1544:17 | $1612: 12,1612: 21$ | 1368:12 | 1582:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1367:7, 1367:8, } \\ & \text { 1368:2, 1370:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| struck [1] - 1542:4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { sub-legal-size }[3] \text { - } \\ \text { 1408:24, 1575:19, } \end{gathered}$ | success [1] - 1583:11 | surprised [3] - 1431:9, | 1370:4, 1371:10, |
| structure [30] - | 1408:24, 1575:19, $1575: 22$ | sudden [1] - 1494:14 <br> suddenly [1] - | 1431:20, 1534:13 | 1376:6, 1376:9, |
| 1372:10, 1504:24, | subheading [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { suddenly [1] - } \\ & \text { 1563:20 } \end{aligned}$ | surrounded [1] - | 1378:23, 1387:14, |
| 1506:14, 1507:7, <br> 1507:10, 1509•19 | 1404:4 | suffer [1] - 1617:11 |  | 1387:16, 1388:13, |
| 1510:17, 1512:19, | subject [6] - 1387:8, | sufficient [2] - 1529:7, | 1596:20 | 1388:15, 1396:1, |
| 1515:6, 1515:17, | 1387:11, 1415:1, | 1576:5 | surveys [3] - 1369:7, | 1396:6, 1396:7, |
| 1517:3, 1517:7, | 1435:5, 1435:17, | suggest [5] - 1479:11, | 1552:2, 1559:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1401:22, 1401:25, } \\ & \text { 1403:10, 1403:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1521:22, 1522:1, | 1539:25 | 1586:8, 1586:21, | survival [1] - 1458:14 | 1413:6, 1419:5, |
| 1522:5, 1522:8, | submission [8] - <br> 1405.7 1407.24 | 1598:17, 1599:23 | survive [3]-1536:13, | 1421:10, 1425:3, |
| 1533:7, 1533:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 1405: 7,1407: 24, \\ & 1416: 7,1466: 23 \end{aligned}$ | suggested [7] - | 1586:3, 1586:7 | 1425:7, 1425:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1543:19, 1543:22, } \\ & 1544: 3,1544: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1416:7, 1466:23, } \\ & \text { 1492:20, 1495:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1418:24, 1484:24, } \\ & \text { REPORTING } \end{aligned}$ | survivorship [3] - | 1426:24, 1426:25, |





| ```1366:13, 1366:24, 1367:11, 1373:5, 1374:23, 1394:21, 1411:9, 1421:15, 1445:20, 1452:20, 1459:11, 1462:1, 1462:21, 1463:24, 1481:7, 1482:9, 1482:20, 1482:23, 1485:2, 1485:6, 1486:20 young [2]-1575:25, 1594:2 younger [1] - 1582:1 yourself [11] - 1372:22, 1394:21, 1479:21, 1495:12, 1495:14, 1496:13, 1503:7, 1506:4, 1520:5, 1532:12, 1561:24``` |
| :---: |
| Z |
| zero [1] - 1570:9 |

