	1927
	1 <u>PROCEEDINGS</u>
	2 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning,
1925	3 counsel.
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES No. 142, Original	4 MS. ALLON: Good morning.
	5 MR SINGARELLA: Good morning your
STATE OF FLORIDA,)	6 Honor
Plaintiff,)) Volume VIII	7 May Lapproach your Honor?
STATE OF GEORGIA	
) Defendants.)	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER. Please.
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	9 MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your
The above-entitled matter came on for HEARING	10 Honor. Paul Singarella for the State of
before SPECIAL MASTER RALPH I. LANCASTER, held in the	11 Florida.
U. S. Bankruptcy Court, at 537 Congress Street,	12 This morning, your Honor, we will be
Portland, Maine, on November 10, 2016, commencing at	13 hearing from Dr. George Hornberger. Would
Notary Public in and for the State of Maine.	14 you like Dr. Hornberger to take the witness
APPEARANCES :	15 chair?
For the State of Florida: PHILIP J. PERRY, ESQ. JAMIE L. WINE, ESO.	16 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
PAUL N. SINGARELLA, ESQ. DEVIN M. O'CONNOR, ESQ.	17 MR. SINGARELLA: Dr. Hornberger.
BENJAMIN E. STEARNS, ESQ.	18 THE CLERK: Please raise your right
For the State of Georgia: CRAIG S. PRIMIS, ESQ. DEVORA W. ALLON, ESQ.	19 hand.
BRITNEY A. LEWIS, ESQ. ANDREW PRUITT, ESQ.	20 Do you solemnly swear that the testimony
Also Present: JOSHUA D. DUNLAP, ESQ.	21 you shall give in the cause now in hearing
	22 shall be the truth, the whole truth, and
THE REPORTING GROUP	23 nothing but the truth, so help you God?
Mason & Lockhart	24 THE WITNESS: I do.
	25 THE CLERK: Please be seated.
	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart
1926	1928
INDEX	1 Pull yourself right up to the microphone
Witness Direct Cross Redirect Recross	2 and please state your name and spell your
George M. Hornberger, 1928 1929 2041 2097	3 last name.
Ph.D.	4 THE WITNESS: My name is George
Brett J. Cyphers 2107 2107 2129	5 Hornberger, H Q R N B F R G F R.
	6 MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I
	7 approach the witness and present him with his
	8 tectimony2
EXHIBITS	
Number Page Referenced	10 MP_SINGAPELLA: Thank you sir
JX-6 2135	11 DIRECT EXAMINATION
JX-21 2079	
JX-54 2003 JX-124 1945	12 DI MR. SINGARELLA:
JX-158 1957	13 Q. Dr. Hornberger, you have in front of you your
	14 written testimony for this matter. Do you adopt
FX-599 2082	15 that written testimony as your own?
FX-785 1937,2009 FX-862a 2115	16 A. Yes, I adopt it.
	17 Q. Thank you, Doctor.
GX-526 2127, 2145 GX-529 2127, 2145	18 MS. ALLON: Good morning, your Honor.
GX-455 2108	19 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
GX-1100 1939	20 MS. ALLON: I haven't had the
	21 opportunity to be up at the podium before, so
	22 I wanted to introduce myself. I'm Devora
	23 Allon from Kirkland & Ellis, the New York
	24 office. And I also wanted to introduce some
	25 of the new faces at our counsel table.
THE REPORTING GROUP	THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason & Lockbart	Mason & Lockhart

		1929			1931
1		Obviously, you know Mr. Primis. We have	1		correct?
2		Ms. Lewis and Mr. Pruitt at the counsel table	2	Α.	We did the calculations.
3		today.	3	Q.	You used the model to simulate the impact of
4		MS. LEWIS: Good morning.	4		different consumption caps. Right?
5		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.	5	Α.	We did the calculations.
6		MS. ALLON: I have some witness binders	6	Q.	So you looked at what would happen in terms of
7		that I would like to hand up with the Court's	7		flows into Florida, what the volume of the
8		permission.	8		increase of those flows would be under different
9		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, ma'am.	9		consumption cap scenarios; is that right?
10		CROSS-EXAMINATION	10	Α.	We did those calculations, but they were not part
11	BY	MS. ALLON:	11		of my opinion set.
12	Q.	Good morning, Dr. Hornberger.	12		MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative
13	Α.	Good morning, Ms. Allon.	13		No. 1.
14	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, for this case you were asked to	14	BY	MS. ALLON:
15	-	assess the impact of both increases and decreases	15	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, if you look at the screen, this
16		in Georgia's consumptive use on state line flows	16		is a manifestation, so to speak, of a model run
17		into Florida Is that correct?	17		that you did in your data-driven ResSim model
18	Δ.	Yes	18		Is that right?
19	0	And for that analysis you used reservoir	19	Δ	Yes It certainly looks like it
20	ч.	modeling: is that correct?	20	0	Okay And if you read at the bottom the run is
20	^	As part of the applysis was	20	α.	called half add IBT add back. Do you see that?
21	<u> </u>	In your two different models that you developed	21	Δ	
22	α.	you had the data-driven Persim model, and you had	22	<u> </u>	And the description save 50 percent, and then a
23		the Lake Seminale model; is that correct?	23	α.	and the description says, 50 percent, and then a
24	۸		24		parenthetical, and in plus Ag point, close
25	Α.		25		
		Mason & Lockbart			Mason & Lockhart
		1030			1032
1	0	All right Let's start with your data-driven	1		1932
1	Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is	1	Δ	1932 that?
1 2 3	Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and	1 2 3	A.	1932 that? Yes.
1 2 3 4	Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps: is that	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin: is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model: is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. А.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Bight. Your model uses a different flow input	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin: is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model: isn't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACE Basin;
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes. Now, you used your data-driven ResSim model to look at the impact of decreases in Georgia's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is that right? Yes
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes. Now, you used your data-driven ResSim model to look at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use on the amount of flow that would	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes. Now, you used your data-driven ResSim model to look at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use on the amount of flow that would cross the state line into Florida: is that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is that right? Yes. Your model simulated how much additional water would on to Elorida if this specific cap was
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes. Now, you used your data-driven ResSim model to look at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use on the amount of flow that would cross the state line into Florida; is that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is that right? Yes. Your model simulated how much additional water would go to Florida if this specific cap was
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1930 All right. Let's start with your data-driven ResSim model. Your data-driven ResSim model is based on the ResSim model that was developed and used by the United States Army Corps; is that correct? Yes. You made some modifications to the Army Corps model; is that right? Not the model itself, but to the reservoir inflows. Right. Your model uses a different flow input than the Army Corps model does? Yes. But, otherwise, your data-driven ResSim is pretty similar to the Army Corps' ResSim model; isn't that right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model uses the same reservoir operating rules as the Army Corps model. Right? Yes. Now, you used your data-driven ResSim model to look at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use on the amount of flow that would cross the state line into Florida; is that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockbart	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1932 that? Yes. The consumption cap scenario that you were modeling in this run includes an elimination of 50 percent of agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? It's 50 percent of what we estimated as a conservative lower bound on agricultural withdrawals. And this consumption cap also includes a 50 percent elimination of small farm ponds in the Flint River Basin; is that correct? Yes. And this consumption cap scenario that you modeled also includes a 100 percent elimination of all interbasin transfers out of the ACF Basin; is that correct? Yes. And you looked at what the benefit to Florida would be in terms of additional flows at the state line if these cutbacks were imposed. Is that right? Yes. Your model simulated how much additional water would go to Florida if this specific cap was THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

TRIAL - November 10, 2016 (Vol. VIII)

		1933			1935	
1		imposed under a variety of hydrologic conditions;	1		that cutting Georgia's Ag use in half would	
2		is that right?	2		produce zero cfs of additional flow at the state	
3	Α.	Yes.	3		line into Florida for 153 days in a year with	
4	Q.	And those hydrologic conditions that you	4		similar hydrologic conditions to 2012; is that	
5		considered are based on historical hydrologic	5		correct?	
6		conditions; is that right?	6	Α.	It calculated that result, yes.	
7	Α.	Yes.	7	Q.	For every single one of these days that we just	
8	Q.	So, for example, how much additional flow would	8		walked through, your modeling from data-driven	
9		be produced from this consumption cap under	9		ResSim showed no impact at the state line from	
10		hydrologic conditions similar to the summer of	10		eliminating half of all of Georgia's irrigation	
11		2007. Correct?	11		in the Flint River Basin at that time; is that	
12	Α.	Amongst others, yes.	12		correct?	
13	Q.	Now, you're aware of the result also of this	13	Α.	Half of the minimum estimate lower bound	
14		modeling analysis; aren't you?	14		estimate. And it calculated it. It didn't show	
15	Α.	Yes.	15		it.	
16	Q.	All right. Let's take a look at what you found.	16	Q.	The results from your data-driven ResSim model	
17		MS. ALLON: And I want to pull up	17		where you looked at scenarios where Georgia's	
18		demonstrative No. 2, please.	18		consumptive use was decreased showed that there	
19	BY I	MS. ALLON:	19		were several months in several different years	
20	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, you found that when you modeled	20		where there was no impact at the state line as a	
21		the scenario we just looked at, which included a	21		result of any of the reductions in the scenarios	
22		50 percent reduction in Georgia's agricultural	22		that you modeled; is that correct?	
23		use, that scenario would produce zero cfs of	23	Α.	It calculated those results, yes.	
24		additional flow at the state line for 63 days in	24	Q.	Now, you conducted this modeling before you	
25		the year 2000. Isn't that right?	25		submitted your expert report; is that correct?	
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart	
		1934			1936	
1	Α.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations	1	Α.	1936 Yes.	
1 2	А.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP.	1 2	A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you	
1 2 3	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim	1 2 3	A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct?	
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario	1 2 3 4	A. Q. A.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report.	
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these	
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero additional flow at the state line for 93 total	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use increased. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero additional flow at the state line for 93 total days in a year with hydrologic conditions similar	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use increased. Right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero additional flow at the state line for 93 total days in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2011; is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero additional flow at the state line for 93 total days in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2011; is that correct? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your data-driven the impact fuel fuel Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero additional flow at the state line for 93 total days in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2011; is that correct? Yes. And finally, your data-driven ResSim model showed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your data-driven the impact of increases increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your Yes. And in order to do that, you used your data-driven ResSim model to simulate the impact of decreased inflows into the reservoir system;	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1934 This is for data-driven ResSim and calculations of minimum releases under the RIOP. Dr. Hornberger, under your data-driven ResSim model run, under the consumption cap scenario that we just walked through, your model predicted there would be 63 total days of zero cfs additional flow at the state line under hydrological conditions similar to 2000. Is that correct? Yes. The data-driven ResSim model produced that result. And your data-driven ResSim model also predicted that under this consumption cap scenario where Georgia's consumptive use was cut by 50 percent, there would be 81 total days of zero additional flow at the state line in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2007. Is that right? Yes. And your model also predicted that using the same consumption cap scenario would produce zero additional flow at the state line for 93 total days in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to 2011; is that correct? Yes. And finally, your data-driven ResSim model showed THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1936 Yes. And you were aware of these results before you submitted your expert report; is that correct? Yes. I produced them with the expert report. But your report itself doesn't discuss these results; does it? It does not. My opinions were not based on the results of the data-driven ResSim model for reduction scenarios. Now, we just talked about this analysis where you looked at the impact of decreases in Georgia's consumptive use. You also used your data-driven ResSim model to analyze the impact of increases in Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And those results were included in your expert report? Yes. You were trying to figure out what would happen to state line flows if Georgia's consumptive use increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your data-driven to fince asses increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your data-driven to fince asses increased. Right? Yes. And in order to do that, you used your data-driven ResSim model to simulate the impact of decreased inflows into the reservoir system; THE REPORTING GROUP	

		1937			1939
1		is that right?	1		reservoirs. Right?
2	Α.	Yes.	2	Α.	Table 11 doesn't show could you repeat that?
3	Q.	And for this analysis of increased consumptive	3	Q.	Table 11 doesn't say anything about the decrease
4		use, you modeled a scenario that involved	4		in water entering the reservoirs that generated
5		projections for future water use for Georgia in	5		the decrease in state line flows that you
6		the year 2050; is that correct?	6		identified in table 11?
7	Α.	Yes.	7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	All right. Let's take a look at your results	8	Q.	Now, we did get the information you were
9		from that modeling, and I want to turn to your	9		referring to and walked through it. And it's at
10		expert report. It's in the binder in front of	10		GX-1100, which is in the binders you have in
11		you. It's FX-785. And I want to turn	11		front of you; and I'll put it up on the screen as
12		specifically to page 53, table 11.	12		well.
13		Now, Dr. Hornberger, table 11 in FX-785 shows	13		Now, GX-1100 shows your values from table 11
14		the results of your data-driven ResSim modeling	14		for future use scenario where Georgia's
15		of the impact of Georgia's projected future water	15		consumptive use was increased to the levels that
16		use on state line flows; isn't that right?	16		Florida projects for 2050. Right?
17	Α.	Yes.	17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	And specifically scenario 1, where it says,	18	Q.	And the column that says table 11, scenario 1,
19		Future Increases in Water Consumption in Georgia.	19		Reduction in Outflow, that's reproduced from what
20		Right?	20		we just looked at in table 11 in your report.
21	Α.	Yes.	21		Right?
22	Q.	So let's just look at 2000 as an example. Your	22	Α.	Yes. It looks that way.
23		modeling using data-driven ResSim shows that if	23	Q.	Now, what GX-1100 also includes is the total
24		Georgia's water use rose to the levels that	24		reduction in inflow to the reservoirs over the
25		Florida is projecting, state line flows would be	25		same time period. Those are the columns that say
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1938			1940
1		decreased by 231 cfs in a year with hydrologic	1		June, July, August, September, and then the
2		conditions similar to 2000. Is that right?	2		average. Right?
2 3	Α.	conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes.	2 3	А.	average. Right? Yes.
2 3 4	A. Q.	conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine	2 3 4	A. Q.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and
2 3 4 5	A. Q.	conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right?	2 3 4 5	A. Q.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't
2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we? It looks that way, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we? It looks that way, yes. Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. А. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А. Q. А. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we? It looks that way, yes. Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	А. Q. А. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100.We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows.Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? In the scenario 1, yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? In the scenario 1, yes. But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated increase was in consumptive use that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100.We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows.Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? In the scenario 1, yes. But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated increase was in consumptive use that caused that decline? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we? It looks that way, yes. Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right? Yes. In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see that? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? In the scenario 1, yes. But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated increase was in consumptive use that caused that decline? It does not. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we? It looks that way, yes. Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right? Yes. In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see that? Yes. Let's use 2002 as an example. Under your future
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? In the scenario 1, yes. But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated increase was in consumptive use that caused that decline? It does not. And table 11 doesn't say anything about what the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100.We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows.Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see that?Yes.Let's use 2002 as an example. Under your future use scenario that you're modeling, Georgia's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated increase was in consumptive use that caused that decline? It does not. And table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated decrease was in water entering the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right? Yes. And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we? It looks that way, yes. Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right? Yes. In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see that? Yes. Let's use 2002 as an example. Under your future use scenario that you're modeling, Georgia's projected increases in consumptive use lead to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 conditions similar to 2000. Is that right? Yes. And you go through that analysis for nine different years in table 11; isn't that right? Yes. But what you don't report in table 11 or anywhere else in your report is the magnitude of the increase in Georgia's consumptive use that caused the state line flow decline you identified; is that right? Well, we had to produce that. You produced that after Georgia asked you for that at your deposition; isn't that right? I don't recall. I thought that we had produced that with the report. In table 11, you say how much state line flows go down. Right? But table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated increase was in consumptive use that caused that decline? It does not. And table 11 doesn't say anything about what the associated decrease was in water entering the THE REPORTING GROUP 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	average. Right?Yes.And we used your inflow data for the columns, and we accurately reproduced it in GX-1100, didn't we?It looks that way, yes.Now, we can see two different things in GX-1100. We can see the magnitude of the decrease in flows caused by Georgia's projected increased water consumption for this scenario, and we can also see how much of that decrease actually materialized into a decrease in state line flows. Right?Yes.In the column on the far right where it says Reduction in Outflow Over Reduction in Inflow, we also included the percent impact of the decreased inflow to the reservoir under this scenario on the decreased outflow into Florida. Do you see that?Yes.Let's use 2002 as an example. Under your future use scenario that you're modeling, Georgia's projected increases in consumptive use lead to THE REPORTING GROUP

		1941			1943
1		average decreased inflow into the reservoirs of	1	ΒY	MS. ALLON:
2		1500 cfs for June through September. Is that	2	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, you recall giving a deposition in
3		right?	3		this case. Is that right?
4	Α.	Yes.	4	Α.	Oh, yes.
5	Q.	So Florida predicts that in this 2050 future-use	5	Q.	For three days we sat together; is that correct?
6		scenario, Georgia's consumptive use will cause	6	Α.	That's correct.
7		1500 less cfs to enter the reservoir system on	7	Q.	Okay. And there was a court reporter there?
8		average in June through September. Is that	8	Α.	Yes.
9		right?	9	Q.	And you were under oath?
10	Α.	Yes.	10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	And your modeling, using the data-driven ResSim	11	Q.	And you told the truth. Right?
12		model that you included in your report, shows	12	Α.	I did.
13		that if 1500 less cfs enters the reservoir system	13	Q.	Okay. And I want to turn to page 735 in your
14		in a year with hydrologic conditions similar to	14		deposition transcript, line 23. And I'm going to
15		2002, the corresponding decrease in state line	15		ask Mr. Smith to play clip 159.
16		flows will be 120 cfs; is that right?	16		(Whereupon the video was played.)
17	Α.	That's what the data-driven ResSim model	17	BY I	MS. ALLON:
18		calculates, yes.	18	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, were you asked those questions;
19	Q.	Your modeling shows that in a year with	19		and did you give those answers?
20		hydrologic conditions similar to 2002, only	20	Α.	Yes.
21		8 percent of the decreased flow entering the	21	Q.	Now, your new Lake Seminole model was created
22		reservoir system as a result of Georgia's	22		specifically for the purpose of this litigation;
23		increased consumptive use will materialize as a	23		isn't that correct?
24		decrease at the state line. Isn't that correct?	24	Α.	That is correct.
25	Α.	That is what is calculated, yes.	25	Q.	You have never used the Lake Seminole model in
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1942			1944
1	Q.	Let's look at the line at the bottom of GX-1100	1		the past with respect to any other matter; isn't
2		that says average. Do you see that?	2		that right?
3	Α.	Yes.	3	Α.	That is correct.
4	Q.	The average reduction in inflows as a result of	4	Q.	In fact, no one has ever used your Lake Seminole
5		Georgia's projected increased consumptive use in	5		model outside of this case; isn't that right?
6		this scenario from June through September of the	6	Α.	Yes.
7		nine years that you model is 1389 cfs; is that	7	Q.	Florida has never used this model before?
8		correct?	8	Α.	Do I understand from the inflection that that's a
9	Α.	Yes.	9		question?
10	Q.	And your model shows that the average reduction	10	Q.	It is a question.
11		in state line flows into Florida for this same	11	Α.	No. Florida has not used it.
12		period of time is 433 cfs. Is that right?	12	Q.	The Army Corps has never used your Lake Seminole
13	Α.	That is what the model calculates, yes.	13	_	model before; has it?
14	Q.	After you ran your data-driven ResSim model, you	14	Α.	No.
15	_	developed a second model. Right?	15	Q.	Okay. Now, there are five reservoirs in the ACF
16	Α.	No. It wasn't after I ran the data-driven	16	_	Basin. Right?
17	_	ResSim.	17	Α.	Yes.
18	Q.	Your testimony is that you did not create the	18	Q.	The Army Corps ResSim model simulates all five
19		Lake Seminole model after you created the	19	-	reservoirs in the system. Right?
20		data-driven ResSim model?	20	A.	There is calculations for all five, yes.
21	Α.	My best recollection is that we developed these	21	Q.	Your data-driven ResSim model also simulates all
22		in parallel.	22		five reservoirs in the system. Right?
23		MS. ALLON: Your Honor, I would like to	23	A.	Yes.
24		hand a copy of Dr. Hornberger's deposition	24	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model does not simulate all
25		transcript, if that's all right.	25		tive reservoirs in the system. Right?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			

		1945			1947
1	Α.	It doesn't do calculations on all five.	1		That's what the Corps says. Right?
2	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model only simulates a single	2	Α.	Yes.
3		reservoir, Lake Seminole. Right?	3	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model doesn't have the ability
4	Α.	Right. We used the data, the actual data for the	4		to adjust conditions at any other reservoir
5		other reservoirs as an input.	5		besides for Lake Seminole. Isn't that right?
6	Q.	Lake Seminole is operated as run-of-river.	6	Α.	The conditions are adjusted according to the
7		Right?	7		recorded record. So according to the data, the
8	Α.	Basically.	8		data themselves adjust the Lake Seminole model.
9	Q.	Which means pretty much that water just passes	9	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, I would like you to turn to page
10		through rather than being held in storage; isn't	10		63 in your deposition transcript.
11		that right?	11		MS. ALLON: And I would like to ask
12	Α.	To a large extent.	12		Mr. Smith to play clip 28.
13	Q.	Three of the other ACF reservoirs, Lake Lanier,	13		(Whereupon the video was played.)
14		West Point, and Walter F. George, collectively	14	ΒY	MS. ALLON:
15		hold 100 percent of the system's storage	15	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, you were asked that question; and
16		capacity. Right?	16		you gave that answer. Right?
17	Α.	Close.	17	Α.	Yes.
18		MS. ALLON: Your Honor, I'm going to be	18	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model does not and cannot do
19		referring to JX-124 a few times in my	19		any type of calculation involving the other four
20		cross-examination. It's the Army Corps DEIS,	20		reservoirs in the ACF system; is that right?
21		and it's an extraordinarily lengthy document.	21	Α.	Yes.
22		The Court has a copy of the full exhibit.	22	Q.	Now, let's go to tab 6 behind JX-124. It's
23		It's four binders. So I thought I would just	23		appendix E to volume 1 of the DEIS. Now,
24		excerpt some of it in the witness binder.	24		appendix E is the ResSim modeling report that the
25		But if the Court or if the witness would like	25		Corps prepared in connection with the DEIS: is
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1946			1948
1		1946	1		1948
1		1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind	1	Α.	1948 that correct? That's what it says.
1 2 3		1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124.	1 2 3	A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document?
1 2 3 4	BY	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON:	1 2 3 4	A. Q. A.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, ves.
1 2 3 4 5	BY 1 Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS.	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19
1 2 3 4 5 6	BY I Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	BY I Q. A.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY I Q. A. Q. A.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. Q. Q. A.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY 1 Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY I Q. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY Q. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY 1 Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY 1 Q. Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY 1 Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY 1 Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BY 1 Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY 1 Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps says, the reservoirs in the ACF Basin are managed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida. And the Corps says that releases are assigned to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY 1 Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps says, the reservoirs in the ACF Basin are managed and operated in accordance with authorized	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida. And the Corps says that releases are assigned to Jim Woodruff but are supported by the upstream
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps says, the reservoirs in the ACF Basin are managed and operated in accordance with authorized project purposes and as an integrated system of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida. And the Corps says that releases are assigned to Jim Woodruff but are supported by the upstream reservoirs through tandem balancing operations.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	BY 1 Q. Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps says, the reservoirs in the ACF Basin are managed and operated in accordance with authorized project purposes and as an integrated system of water resource projects in which each reservoir	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida. And the Corps says that releases are assigned to Jim Woodruff but are supported by the upstream reservoirs through tandem balancing operations. Do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY 1 Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps says, the reservoirs in the ACF Basin are managed and operated in accordance with authorized project purposes and as an integrated system of water resource projects in which each reservoir has a role to play.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida. And the Corps says that releases are assigned to Jim Woodruff but are supported by the upstream reservoirs through tandem balancing operations. Do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY 1 Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1946 the full copy, we can provide it. So I'm going to start at tab 1 behind JX-124. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as the DEIS. Is that correct? Yes, I do. And you're familiar with this document. Right? Reasonably. It's the Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Army Corps in October 2015 as part of their update and revision to the Water Control Manual for the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. Let's turn to tab 4, which is page 2-63. And you can see the heading at the top of the page, the Corps is describing the ACF Water Control Objectives and Guidelines. Do you see that? Yes. And if you look three paragraphs down, the Corps says, the reservoirs in the ACF Basin are managed and operated in accordance with authorized project purposes and as an integrated system of water resource projects in which each reservoir has a role to play. THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1948 that correct? That's what it says. And are you familiar with this document? Yes. I have looked at it, yes. Let's go to tab 7 behind JX-124, which is page 19 of appendix E. And do you see section F where it says System Operations? Yes. And under section F, System Operations, the Corps has said that the four large reservoirs in the ACF are viewed as a system in which each reservoir has its role to play. Do you see that? Yes. The Corps also says that, many interests and conditions must be continually considered and balanced when making water control decisions. Do you see that? Yes. Okay. Now, in the next paragraph, the Corps talks specifically about releases into Florida. And the Corps says that releases are assigned to Jim Woodruff but are supported by the upstream reservoirs through tandem balancing operations. Do you see that? Yes. THE REPORTING GROUP

		1949			1951
1	Q.	Now, you understand that in this litigation,	1		Seminole model. Right?
2		Georgia's experts have opined that increased	2	Α.	Yes.
3		flows on the Flint that are generated by	3	Q.	And you also did a goodness of fit analysis for
4		decreases in consumptive use in Georgia's	4		your data-driven ResSim model. Right?
5		consumptive use would be offset by decreases from	5	Α.	Yes.
6		the reservoirs and would, therefore, typically	6	Q.	And you relied on your goodness of fit analysis
7		not be passed through to Florida as additional	7		as evidence that your Lake Seminole model is
8		state line flows. Do you understand that?	8		superior to your data-driven ResSim model.
9	Α.	I'm aware of that.	9		Right?
10	Q.	Because your Lake Seminole model doesn't simulate	10	Α.	That's one piece of it, yes.
11		the other four reservoirs or their interaction	11		MS. ALLON: Let's put up demonstrative
12		with Woodruff Dam, it is mathematically	12		No. 3, please.
13		impossible for your Lake Seminole model to	13	BY	MS. ALLON:
14		respond to increased flows on the Flint by	14	Q.	For the goodness of fit analysis that you
15		releasing less from the upstream reservoirs;	15		performed, you used two numerical indices; is
16		isn't that right?	16		that right?
17	Α.	The mathematically we're actually, of	17	Α.	Yes.
18		course, using the data that indicate how the	18	Q.	Okay, NSE and PBIAS,
19		Corns actually operates. And so the Corns on a	19	Δ.	Yes.
20		day-to-day operation is not using ResSim.	20	0.	NSE is the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency and it's an
21		They're using the measurements of the reservoirs	21		index used to assess the predictive power of
22		And so in that sense, of course, we have taken it	22		hydrological models Isn't that right?
23		into account But in the sense that you	23	Δ	It's used to assess how well a model agrees with
23		indicated previously we do not do calculations	23		data
25		on the other reservoirs	25	0	It lets you know how close to perfectly your
23			25	ω.	
		Mason & Lockbart			Mason & Lockhart
		Mason & Lockhait			
		1050			1050
4	0	1950			1952
1	Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question,	1	٨	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right?
1 2	Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole	1 2	A.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes.
1 2 3	Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate	1 2 3	A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1.
1 2 3 4	Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs?	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at FX-785. And this FX-785, this is the first
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right? Yes. A goodness of fit analysis looks at how well a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at FX-785. And this FX-785, this is the first report that you submitted in connection with this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right? Yes. A goodness of fit analysis looks at how well a model fits the observed data. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at FX-785. And this FX-785, this is the first report that you submitted in connection with this case. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right? Yes. A goodness of fit analysis looks at how well a model fits the observed data. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at FX-785. And this FX-785, this is the first report that you submitted in connection with this case. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right? Yes. A goodness of fit analysis looks at how well a model fits the observed data. Right? Yes. You did a goodness of fit analysis for your Lake	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at FX-785. And this FX-785, this is the first report that you submitted in connection with this case. Right? Yes. Now, let's go to the bottom of page 47 and the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950 And I'm just asking a very discrete question, Dr. Hornberger, which is does your Lake Seminole model have the ability mathematically to evaluate the possibility of additional inflow on the Flint affecting storage at upstream reservoirs? No. We did not do calculations on upstream reservoirs. Now, you testified that you had to create your Lake Seminole model because of limitations that you observed both in ResSim and your data-driven ResSim; is that correct? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model is better than ResSim and your data-driven ResSim at faithfully reflecting Army Corps operations. Is that right? Yes. Now, one way to assess the strengths or accuracy of a model is by doing a goodness of fit analysis; is that right? Yes. A goodness of fit analysis looks at how well a model fits the observed data. Right? Yes. You did a goodness of fit analysis for your Lake THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1952 model agrees with observed data. Right? Yes. Okay. A perfect score in the NSE index is a 1. Right? Yes. So you want your NSE to be as close to 1 as possible? Right. When we're looking at models, yes. And percent bias, or PBIAS, is an index that tells you whether your model has a bias, meaning is it under-predicting or over-predicting the data. Right? Yes. A PBIAS that is close to zero means little bias. Right? Yes. So you want your PBIAS to be as close to zero as possible. Right? Yes. Now, let's go back to your expert report at FX-785. And this FX-785, this is the first report that you submitted in connection with this case. Right? Yes. Now, let's go to the bottom of page 47 and the THE REPORTING GROUP

		1953			1955
1		top of page 48 in FX-785.	1		transcript to page 447.
2	Α.	Yes.	2		MS. ALLON: And, Mr. Smith, could you
3	Q.	And do you see where you write, as shown in table	3		please place clip 104.
4		10 it's about three lines up from the bottom	4		(Whereupon the video was played.)
5		of the page. You say, as shown in table 10, the	5	BY	MS. ALLON:
6		NSE for the Lake Seminole model is much closer to	6	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, were you asked those questions,
7		1, meaning that it is a closer match to observed	7		and did you give those answers?
8		flows. Similarly, the PBIAS statistic is closer	8	Α.	Yes.
9		to zero for the Lake Seminole model, again	9	Q.	Now, let's go back to your report at FX-785, and
10		indicating that this model tracks the observed	10		we were on page 48. And I want to take a look at
11		flows more closely than the data-driven ResSim	11		your original goodness of fit results that you
12		model.	12		reported in your February 29 report. So I'm on
13		Do you see that?	13		nage 48 table 10 at EX-785. Do you see that?
14	Δ	Ves	14	Δ	
15	0	So you cited your goodness of fit results as a	15	0	Now table 10 shows your original results for
16	ч.	hasis for saving your Lake Seminole model does a	16	ч.	your goodness of fit analysis Right?
17		better job of predicting actual releases from	17	Δ	
18		Woodruff Dam than your data-driven PecSim model?	18	0	Now, this analysis is based off the entire period
10	^	Voc. It's one of the metrics that we looked at	10	α.	of records. Is that right?
20	<u> </u>	And you cold in your report that your lake	20	۸	
20	ω.		20	A.	
21		to 1 Dight2	21	ц.	All 57 years of now data from 1976 to 2012.
22	^		22	^	
23	A.	And a DRIAS closer to zero?	23	A.	And table 10 is what you were referring to just a
24	Q.		24	ω.	And table 10 is what you were relearning to just a
25	А.		25		
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1954			1056
1	0	1954	1		1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than
1	Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven BesSim model	1		1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero
1 2 3	Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you	1 2 3		1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right?
1 2 3 4	Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts	1 2 3 4	Δ.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data	1 2 3 4 5	A.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows?
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric: but we were focused, of	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. Q. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	А. Q. A. Q. А. Q. ВУ	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А. Q. Q. A. Q. A. BY Q. А.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess the fits of the two models. But it wasn't that,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model actually had a better goodness of fit than your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess the fits of the two models. But it wasn't that, you know, that was the basis of the decision to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model actually had a better goodness of fit than your Lake Seminole model. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess the fits of the two models. But it wasn't that, you know, that was the basis of the decision to use it. There were many other reasons that we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model actually had a better goodness of fit than your Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess the fits of the two models. But it wasn't that, you know, that was the basis of the decision to use it. There were many other reasons that we wanted to use the Lake Seminole model.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model actually had a better goodness of fit than your Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model had an NSE closer
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess the fits of the two models. But it wasn't that, you know, that was the basis of the decision to use it. There were many other reasons that we wanted to use the Lake Seminole model. Dr. Hornberger, could you turn in your deposition	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's correct. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model actually had a better goodness of fit than your Lake Seminole model. Right? Your data-driven ResSim model had an NSE closer to 1. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q.	1954 And one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model when you modeled consumption caps is because you believed the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data. Right? We used the one metric; but we were focused, of course, on low-flow years. And we also looked at the graphical output from the models because we wanted to make sure that the Lake ResSim model the Lake Seminole model was not, you know, doing something that was not reflective of reality. Okay. I was asking a different question. My question was one of the reasons you used the Lake Seminole model instead of the data-driven ResSim model is because of your belief that the Lake Seminole model better predicts the data than the data-driven ResSim model. We I can't say yes as you phrased it. It wasn't the reason that we used the Lake Seminole model. We did look at those metrics to assess the fits of the two models. But it wasn't that, you know, that was the basis of the decision to use it. There were many other reasons that we wanted to use the Lake Seminole model. Dr. Hornberger, could you turn in your deposition THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	1956 Seminole model has an NSE much closer to 1 than the ResSim model and a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. That's what table 10 shows? Yes. Now, after you submitted your report, you realized that the row labels in table 10 were inadvertently switched. Right? Correct. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. That's the language your counsel used in describing what had happened. MS. ALLON: Let's pull up demonstrative No. 4, please. MS. ALLON: This is what your original table 10 should have looked like. Right? Yes. This shows that your data-driven ResSim model actually had a better goodness of fit than your Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. Your data-driven ResSim model had an NSE closer to 1. Right? THE REPORTING GROUP

		1957			1959
1	Α.	Yes.	1		recollection, at page 495.
2	Q.	And your data-driven ResSim model had a PBIAS	2		MS. ALLON: And I'm going to ask
3		closer to 0. Right?	3		Mr. Smith to play clips 122, 121, 123, and
4	Α.	Yes.	4		124, please.
5	Q.	Now, when you acknowledged that you had made a	5		(Whereupon the video was played.)
6		mistake with respect to inadvertently switching	6	BY	MS_ALLON:
7		the rows in your table 10, you actually submitted	7	0	Dr. Hornberger, were you asked those questions
8		a revised table 10 Right?		<u> </u>	and did you give those answers?
å	Δ		9	Δ	Vec
10	<u> </u>	But you didn't just switch the rows back the	10	<u> </u>	I co.
10	α.	right way Dight2	10	ω.	of pipe dry years since 2000 as the hydrologic
11	٨	T I don't think I understand the substitut	40		of thine dry years since 2000 as the hydrologic
12	A.	I I don't timik I understand the question.	12	^	
13	Q.	Let's pull up your revised table 10. It's in	13	A.	Yes.
14		JX-158. And it is attachment 1 to that JX. So	14	Q.	And for those nine years since 2000 that you have
15		It's the second to last page.	15		consistently used as the relevant flow record for
16	A.	Right.	16		your analysis, the data-driven Ressim model
17	Q.	Do you see your updated	17		showed a better goodness of fit than the Lake
18	A.	Yes.	18		Seminole model; isn't that right?
19	Q.	table 10?	19	Α.	Yes.
20	Α.	Yes.	20	Q.	It had a ResSim had an NSE closer to 1.
21	Q.	In your updated table 10, your goodness of fit	21	_	Right?
22		scores are based only on the June to September	22	Α.	Yes.
23		period for five specific years. Right?	23	Q.	And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right?
24	Α.	Yes. That's what we did.	24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	Okay. They're not based on all 37 years of flow	25	Q.	Let's consider another dataset. For the June to
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1059			4000
		1900			1960
1	_	data like the ones we just looked at. Right?	1		September period only of the nine dry years since
1 2	Α.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right?	1 2		September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the
1 2 3	A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific	1 2 3		September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years.	1 2 3 4	_	1960 September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5	А.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. Q. A.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the inflection.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950data like the ones we just looked at. Right?Correct.Just June through September of five specificyears.Yes.So your updated table 10 only looks at a subsetof the flow record. Right?Yes.And we did the math at your deposition. We cancertainly walk through it again. But this subsetthat you looked through is only 5 percent of theoriginal 37-year flow record that you hadoriginally considered?Yes.I take that to be a question from theinflection.For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the inflection. For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1990data like the ones we just looked at. Right?Correct.Just June through September of five specific years.Yes.So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right?Yes.And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered?Yes.I take that to be a question from the inflection.For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis in updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990data like the ones we just looked at. Right?Correct.Just June through September of five specificyears.Yes.So your updated table 10 only looks at a subsetof the flow record. Right?Yes.And we did the math at your deposition. We cancertainly walk through it again. But this subsetthat you looked through is only 5 percent of theoriginal 37-year flow record that you hadoriginally considered?Yes.I take that to be a question from theinflection.For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysisin updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim modelshowed superior goodness of fit than the LakeConsidered the percent of the construction of the construct	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950data like the ones we just looked at. Right?Correct.Just June through September of five specificyears.Yes.So your updated table 10 only looks at a subsetof the flow record. Right?Yes.And we did the math at your deposition. We cancertainly walk through it again. But this subsetthat you looked through is only 5 percent of theoriginal 37-year flow record that you hadoriginally considered?Yes.I take that to be a question from theinflection.For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysisin updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim modelshowed superior goodness of fit than the LakeSeminole model. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through in your data-driven ResSim model, you used your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1950data like the ones we just looked at. Right?Correct.Just June through September of five specific years.Yes.So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right?Yes.And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered?Yes.I take that to be a question from the inflection.For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis in updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right?I don't I don't know. I don't have those	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through in your data-driven ResSim model, you used your Lake Seminole model to evaluate the impact of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Isso data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the inflection. For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis in updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? I don't I don't know. I don't have those numbers in front of me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through in your data-driven ResSim model, you used your Lake Seminole model to evaluate the impact of projected 2050 consumptive use levels on state
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Isso data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the inflection. For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis in updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? I don't I don't know. I don't have those numbers in front of me. Dr. Hornberger, why don't we take a look at your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through in your data-driven ResSim model, you used your Lake Seminole model to evaluate the impact of projected 2050 consumptive use levels on state line flows. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Isso data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the inflection. For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis in updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? I don't I don't know. I don't have those numbers in front of me. Dr. Hornberger, why don't we take a look at your deposition, and perhaps that will refresh your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through in your data-driven ResSim model, you used your Lake Seminole model to evaluate the impact of projected 2050 consumptive use levels on state line flows. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	data like the ones we just looked at. Right? Correct. Just June through September of five specific years. Yes. So your updated table 10 only looks at a subset of the flow record. Right? Yes. And we did the math at your deposition. We can certainly walk through it again. But this subset that you looked through is only 5 percent of the original 37-year flow record that you had originally considered? Yes. I take that to be a question from the inflection. For the other 95 percent of the record from 1976 to 2012 that you didn't include in the analysis in updated table 10, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? I don't I don't know. I don't have those numbers in front of me. Dr. Hornberger, why don't we take a look at your deposition, and perhaps that will refresh your THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	September period only of the nine dry years since 2000 that you used for your modeling, the data-driven ResSim model showed superior goodness of fit than the Lake Seminole model. Right? Yes. ResSim had an NSE closer to 1. Right? Yes. And ResSim had a PBIAS closer to zero. Right? Yes. And finally, if you look at all 37 years of flow data, which is the analysis that you originally did, the ResSim model showed superior performance to the Lake Seminole model; isn't that right? Yes. Now, you did a model run of the Lake Seminole model where you looked at increases to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. The model certainly wasn't designed for that, but we did do the run. And like the analysis that we just walked through in your data-driven ResSim model, you used your Lake Seminole model to evaluate the impact of projected 2050 consumptive use levels on state line flows. Right? No. We didn't use it for that. We did the THE REPORTING GROUP

		1961			1963	
1		calculation.	1		real life. Right?	
2	Q.	You didn't report the results of that analysis in	2	Α.	Absolutely.	
3		any of your reports. Right?	3	Q.	In real life, if Lake Seminole was running dry,	
4	Α.	No, I didn't.	4		the Corps would not be releasing hundreds of	
5	Q.	Under the 2050 scenario run, using your Lake	5		thousands of cfs of flow into Florida. Right?	
6		Seminole model, your Lake Seminole model allows	6	Α.	Yes.	
7		Lake Seminole the actual reservoir now, not	7	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model is not appropriate for	
8		the model it allows Lake Seminole to go dry.	8		evaluating increases in Georgia's consumptive	
9		Right?	9		use. Is that right?	
10	Α.	In the model, yes. The certainly it	10	Α.	That is correct.	
11		doesn't it has nothing no control over the	11	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model produces results that	
12		actual Lake Seminole; so the actual Lake Seminole	12		are not faithful to the actual reservoir	
13		can't go dry.	13		operations of the Army Corps; isn't that right?	
14	Q.	That's what your model shows, Right?	14	Α.	Under conditions of decreases or increased use	
15	Α.	The model calculation under those conditions,	15		of water in Georgia, ves. It is it's not	
16		because the model was not designed to handle	16		designed to do that, so it doesn't.	
17		that, it actually does that, ves.	17	Q.	Now. I understand that your testimony is that the	
18	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model predicted that at some	18		Lake Seminole model is not designed to analyze	
19		point Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero	19		increases in Georgia's consumptive use But you	
20		storage Correct?	20		do believe the model is appropriate to use to	
21	Δ	It didn't predict it The model was I didn't	21		analyze decreases in Georgia's consumptive use:	
22		report the model run because the model was never	22		is that right?	
22		designed to do that But if you do the	23	۸	Ves	
23		calculation that is what it shows	23	0	And that's how you used the model in the	
25	0	And again Dr. Hornberger, Lunderstand that your	25	ч.	testimony that you presented to this Court	
23	α.		25			
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart	
		1062			1064	
4		1962	1		Diabt2	
1		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake	1	^	1964 Right?	
1 2		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just	1 2 3	A.	1964 Right? Yes.	
1 2 3		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run.	1 2 3	A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model	
1 2 3 4		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay?	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases	
1 2 3 4 5		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Bight?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	٩	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Α.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry, Woodruff Dam is discharging hundreds of thousands	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry, Woodruff Dam is discharging hundreds of thousands of cfs from Lake Seminole into Florida. Is that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. And under specific extraordinary drought	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry, Woodruff Dam is discharging hundreds of thousands of cfs from Lake Seminole into Florida. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. And under specific extraordinary drought operations, that minimum release can be reduced	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry, Woodruff Dam is discharging hundreds of thousands of cfs from Lake Seminole into Florida. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. And under specific extraordinary drought operations, that minimum release can be reduced to 4500 cfs. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry, Woodruff Dam is discharging hundreds of thousands of cfs from Lake Seminole into Florida. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. And under specific extraordinary drought operations, that minimum release can be reduced to 4500 cfs. Right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1962 testimony is that you didn't think the Lake Seminole model was appropriate. But I'm just asking you about the results of the model run. Okay? And in this scenario that you modeled where your model predicted that Lake Seminole would reach a state of zero storage, that means that Lake Seminole would be completely empty. That's what zero storage means. Right? Yes. And at the same time your model showed Lake Seminole as completely empty, it also calculated an outflow from Woodruff Dam; isn't that right? Yes, I believe that's right. Okay. So there's no water in the reservoir, but your model is saying that Woodruff Dam is releasing water into Florida. Right? The model calculation shows that, yes. Your Lake Seminole model showed that at the same time the reservoir is literally running dry, Woodruff Dam is discharging hundreds of thousands of cfs from Lake Seminole into Florida. Is that right? Yes. You agree that would absolutely not happen in THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1964 Right? Yes. Your opinion is that the Lake Seminole model faithfully reproduces what Woodruff Dam releases would be if Georgia's consumptive use was decreased. Correct? Yes. The Lake Seminole model is your best estimate of how you think the Army Corps would actually operate under the reservoir operating rules. Right? Yes. Now, the Corps operating rules for Woodruff Dam are called the RIOP. Right? Yes. That stands for Revised Interim Operating Plan. Right? Yes. Under the RIOP, the Corps sets a minimum release from Woodruff Dam of 5000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. And under specific extraordinary drought operations, that minimum release can be reduced to 4500 cfs. Right? Yes. THE REPORTING GROUP	

1	Q.	Releases from Jim Woodruff Dam into Florida can	1	Α.	Yes.
2		never go below 4500 cfs. Right?	2	Q.	And that's a scenario from Dr. Sunding, Florida's
3	Α.	Under the RIOP, that's correct.	3		economist. Right?
4	Q.	Now, I understand that Florida is offering an	4	Α.	Yes.
5		opinion through one of its other experts that the	5	Q.	It's a scenario where Dr. Sunding proposes that
6		Corps has discretion to make releases in excess	6		Georgia could cut 1,000 cfs of water use in peak
7		of the 5000 minimum. But you are not offering	7		summer months. Is that correct?
8		the opinion that the Corps has discretion to make	8	Α.	Yes. I believe that's right.
9		releases below the RIOP minimum; are you?	9	Q.	For this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also
10	Α.	I'm not offering that opinion.	10		simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than
11	Q.	You're not aware of any Florida expert who is	11		5,000 cfs. Right?
12		offering the opinion that the Corps has	12	Α.	Yes.
13		discretion to make releases below the 5000	13	Q.	Your Lake Seminole model predicted that if the
14		minimum. Right?	14	-	Corps imposed Dr. Sunding's original proposed cap
15	Α.	That is correct.	15		and Georgia cut its consumptive use by 1,000 cfs
16	Q.	Okay. Let's take a look at the consumption cap	16		in peak summer months, there would be days when
17		scenarios you modeled with the Lake Seminole	17		Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5.000 cfs.
18		model. And let's turn to demonstrative No. 5.	18		Right?
19		These are screen shots that we took from the	19	Α.	Yes.
20		spreadsheet that you produced to us that	20	Q.	Another consumption cap you modeled involved
21		accompanied your model. And you used your Lake	21		eliminating 40 percent of Georgia's irrigation in
22		Seminole model to analyze each of these five	22		two sub-basins. Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway
23		consumption caps and what their impact would be	23		Creek Correct?
_0 24		on state line flows. Is that right?	24		MR. SINGARFILA: Lobiect. Counsel is
25	Α.	Yes.	25		mischaracterizing her own document here.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
			-		
		1966			1968
1	0	1966 Now one of the consumption can scenarios that	1		1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER Sorry Would
1 2	Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use	1		1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question?
1 2 3	Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?	1 2 3	BY	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON:
1 2 3 4	Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4	ВҮ О .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you
1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model	1 2 3 4 5	ВҮ Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than	1 2 3 4 5 6	ВҮ Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5.000 cfs: isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ВҮ Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ВҮ Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says. Feb 27
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ВҮ Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ВҮ Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	вү Q . A . Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. Q.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ΒΥ Q . A . Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	вү Q. А. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	вү Q . A . Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	вү Q . A . Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	вү Q. А. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1966 Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right? Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? Yes. In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right? I believe that's the number.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	вү Q. A. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	вү Q. A. Q. A.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	вү Q. A. Q. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	вү Q. A. Q. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	вү Q . A . Q . Q .	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway Creek. Is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs. Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that right?I believe that's right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	вү Q. A. Q. A.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway Creek. Is that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that right?I believe that's right. Now, another consumption cap scenario that you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	вү Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway Creek. Is that right? Yes. And your Lake Seminole model showed that in that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that right?I believe that's right.Now, another consumption cap scenario that you modeled is what you call in your spreadsheet the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	вү Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway Creek. Is that right? Yes. And your Lake Seminole model showed that in that scenario, there would be outflows from Woodruff
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs. Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that right?I believe that's right. Now, another consumption cap scenario that you modeled is what you call in your spreadsheet the E con scenario. Do you see that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	вү Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway Creek. Is that right? Yes. And your Lake Seminole model showed that in that scenario, there would be outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1966Now, one of the consumption cap scenarios that you modeled was a cut to 1992 consumptive use levels. Is that right?Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model generated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right?Yes.In other words, your Lake Seminole model predicted that if Georgia's consumptive use was capped to 1992 levels, there would be days where Jim Woodruff releases were less than 5,000 cfs.Right?Yes.Your Lake Seminole model computed 28 days of flow below 5,000 cfs. Right?I believe that's the number.The lowest value predicted by your Lake Seminole model for the 1992 consumption cap scenario was 4,313 cfs released from Woodruff Dam; is that right?I believe that's right.Now, another consumption cap scenario that you modeled is what you call in your spreadsheet the E con scenario. Do you see that? THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	вү Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1968 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sorry. Would you repeat the question? MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, another consumption cap you modeled involved the elimination of 40 percent of Ag irrigation in two sub-basins, Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway. And I'm looking specifically at your tab from your spread sheet that says, Feb 27 Ag 40 for Ich. Was there a question there? Did you model a consumption cap that involved the elimination of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in the two specific sub-basins of Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway? We modeled 40 percent reduction in irrigation. We did not ever say anything about elimination of Ag. So part of the answer is yes. You modeled the scenario that involved the reduction of 40 percent of agricultural irrigation in Spring Creek and Ichawaynochaway Creek. Is that right? Yes. And your Lake Seminole model showed that in that scenario, there would be outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs; isn't that right? THE REPORTING GROUP

		1969			1971
1	Α.	Yes.	1		pull up demonstrative No. 6.
2	Q.	Specifically your Lake Seminole model computed 49	2		You talk about low flows days. And you look
3		days of outflow from Woodruff Dam below 5,000 cfs	3		specifically at three difference gages, the
4		in that scenario; isn't that right?	4		Chattahoochee Gage, the Bainbridge Gage, and Iron
5	Α.	Yes.	5		City Gage. Is that right?
6	Q.	And the lowest value your model predicted was	6	Α.	Yes.
7		4.256 cfs: isn't that right?	7	Q.	And you do analysis of recent droughts versus
8	Δ.	I believe that's right.	8		historic droughts, and you say that streamflow
9	0	Now, another consumption can scenario that you	9		during recent droughts is actually lower than
10	<u> </u>	looked at involved a 50 percent reduction in	10		streamflow during historic droughts: is that
11		agricultural irrigation in the Flint River a 50	11		right?
12		nercent reduction of small impoundments, and a	12	Δ	Vec
12		100 nercent elimination of interbasin transfers	12	0	And you have an analysis where you talk about
14		out of the ACE Bacin Icn't that right?	14	ч.	declines in basin yield since 1070; is that
45	^	Voc. Again reduction of E0 percent Ag but that	14		right?
10		is correct	10	^	Noc
10	0	Is correct.	10	A.	Tes.
17	Q.	For this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also	17	ω.	And you also say that groundwater levels are
18		Simulated outnows from woodruin Dam or less than	18		
19	•	5,000 crs. Isn't that correct?	19	A.	res.
20	A.	Yes.	20	Q.	Okay. Let's talk about each of these four points
21	Q.	And finally, the fifth consumption cap that you	21		starting first with the low flow days you
22		looked at is a 50 percent reduction in	22		identify at the Chattahoochee Gage. Now, when
23		agricultural irrigation in the Flint River Basin	23		you talk about low flow days at the Chattahoochee
24		and a 50 percent reduction of small impoundments.	24		Gage, you used 6,000 cfs as a threshold for low
25		Is that right?	25		flows for that analysis. Right?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1970			1972
1	Α.	1970 Yes.	1	Α.	1972 Yes.
1 2	A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model	1 2	A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below
1 2 3	A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less	1 2 3	A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs?	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1970Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs?Yes.Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right?Yes.And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right?Data that I used. I didn't collect the data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? I believe that beflow metrics that you point to If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1970Yes.And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole modelalso simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of lessthan 5,000 cfs?Yes.Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to adifferent topic and talk about your analysis ofwhat you call hydrologic changes in the ACFBasin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changesthat you say are evidence of Georgia'sconsumptive use; is that right?Yes.And it's your opinion that the data you collectedon these hydrologic changes shows obvious impactsto the Apalachicola River in Florida fromGeorgia's consumptive use; is that right?Data that I used. I didn't collect the datamyself.The data that you used on these hydrologic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes, it's your opinion that data shows	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1972 Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? In large part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to if we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes, it's your opinion that data shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3. Figure 3 shows your analysis of the total
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1970 Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes, it's your opinion that data shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? Edit stalk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3. Figure 3 shows your analysis of the total number of consecutive days of flow below 6,000
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes, it's your opinion that data shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Florida from Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? I harge part, yes. Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to if we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3. Figure 3 shows your analysis of the total number of consecutive days of flow below 6,000 cfs at the Chattahoochee Gage. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes, it's your opinion that data shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Motious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, I want to just put up a list of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	<section-header>Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? Jelieve that's a good point to identify as to fwere the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? Let's talk about the flow metrics that you point to if we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3. Figure 3 shows your analysis of the total number of consecutive days of flow below 6,000 cfs at the Chattahoochee Gage. Right?</section-header>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Forida from Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, I want to just put up a list of the hydrologic changes that you observed. So we can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? I believe that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? I believe that be flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3. Figure 3 shows your analysis of the total number of consecutive days of flow below 6,000 cfs at the Chattahoochee Gage. Right? Kes. Okay. And figure 3 is based on USGS gage data
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And for this scenario, your Lake Seminole model also simulated outflows from Woodruff Dam of less than 5,000 cfs? Yes. Dr. Hornberger, I would like to move to a different topic and talk about your analysis of what you call hydrologic changes in the ACF Basin. Now, you point to some hydrologic changes that you say are evidence of Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Yes. And it's your opinion that the data you collected on these hydrologic changes shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use; is that right? Data that I used. I didn't collect the data myself. The data that you used on these hydrologic changes, it's your opinion that data shows obvious impacts to the Apalachicola River in Florida from Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, I want to just put up a list of the hydrologic changes that you observed. So we can THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. And your opinion is that since 1970, flows below 6,000 cfs occur more frequently and for longer in the ACF Basin; is that right? Yes. And you say that 1970 is when Georgia's water use escalated significantly. Right? Jelieve that's a good point to identify as to where the increases began. And you conclude that, therefore, Georgia's water use is causing the reduced flows that you observe at the Chattahoochee Gage. Is that right? Ist's talk about the flow metrics that you point to. If we turn in your report I'm sorry, in your direct testimony, which is in the witness binder, and I believe you have a loose copy of it as well. But it's the first tab in the witness binder. And I want to turn to page 23 and look at figure 3. Figure 3 shows your analysis of the total number of consecutive days of flow below 6,000 cfs at the Chattahoochee Gage. Right? Yes. Okay. And figure 3 is based on USGS gage data <u>I'HE REPORTING GROUP</u>

		1973			1975	
1		for the Chattahoochee Gage; is that right?	1		show any years in that period with more than 10	
2	Α.	Yes.	2		consecutive days below 6,000 cfs. Is that right?	
3	Q.	And you compare pre-970 to post-1970. Right?	3	Α.	Yes.	
4	Α.	Well, all the years, for the record, are on that	4		MS. ALLON: Let's pull up cross	
5		figure.	5		demonstrative No. 8, please.	
6	0	In the corresponding text of your direct where	6	Q	Dr. Hornberger, you recognize this as a clin in	
7	~ .	you discuss figure 3, the point of your analysis	7	~ .	the LISGS website _ Right?	
, ,		is that you compare pro 1070 to post 1070	,	^	Voc	
0			0	Α.	MC ALLON: And your llanar the	
9	•		9		MS. ALLON: And, your Honor, the	
10	A.	Yes.	10		demonstratives are all in the witness binder;	
11	Q.	And you say that since 1970, there have been	11		and they're numbered if the Court would	
12		more stretches of consecutive low flow days than	12		prefer to look at them in hard copy.	
13		pre-1970?	13		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.	
14	Α.	Yes.	14		MS. ALLON: There's a tab that says	
15	Q.	Now, looking at figure 3, the vast majority of	15		Demonstratives, and they're all behind that	
16		consecutive days below 6,000 cfs that you	16		tab. And same for the witness if that would	
17		observe that you identify occur in 2007 and	17		be easier.	
18		2012. Right?	18		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.	
19	Α.	The the largest bars are in 2007 and 2012,	19		That saves me from asking you to produce	
20		yes.	20		copies of them.	
21	Q.	2007 and 2012 were both severe droughts in the	21	BY	MS. ALLON:	
22		ACF Basin. Right?	22	Q.	And I'm on tab demonstrative No. 8 right	
23	Δ.	Yes	23		now	
24	0	In figure	24		MR SINGARELLA: Your Honor we're	
25	Δ.	They were severe hydrological droughts wes	25		seeing materials for the first time here this	
23			23			
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart	
					1070	
		1974			1976	
1		1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't	1		1976 morning, including these materials.	
1 2		1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The	1 2		1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I.	
1 2 3		1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low.	1 2 3		1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it	
1 2 3 4	Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007	1 2 3 4		1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor.	
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low?	1 2 3 4 5		1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955.	1 2 3 4 5 6	BY	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON:	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ВҮ Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ВҮ Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	вү Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ВҮ Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ΒΥ Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	вү Q. А. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ВҮ Q. A. Q .	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BY Q. A. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ВҮ Q . Q .	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	вү Q . Q .	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY Q. A. Q. A.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ВҮ Q. A. Q. А. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, lanuary 12	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the nast 45 years: but that use had no impact	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q. A. Q. A.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric weire looking at in forum 2 for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 20	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? Mour opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric we're looking at in figure 3 for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? Mour opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric we're looking at in figure 3 for the first 30 of those years. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it would be helpful if you used the joint	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric we're looking at in figure 3 for the first 30 of those years. Right? By this metric, that is correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 33	BY Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it would be helpful if you used the joint exhibit numbers on these because I don't see	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric we're looking at in figure 3 for the first 30 of those years. Right? By this metric, that is correct. New, let's look at the pre-1970 period,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it would be helpful if you used the joint exhibit numbers on these because I don't see them numbered as 8 or 9.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? No. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? No flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? By this metric, yes. Your opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric we're looking at in figure 3 for the first 30 of those years. Right? Mew, let's look at the pre-1970 period, specifically the period 1950 to 1970. You don't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Isit on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it would be helpful if you used the joint exhibit numbers on these because I don't see them numbered as 8 or 9. MS. ALLON: Your Honor, they should have	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1974 That is, they were low flows. They weren't necessarily severe meteorological droughts. The precipitation wasn't exceptionally low. Your testimony is that the precipitation in 2007 and 2012 was not exceptionally low? Mo. I would say not compared with 1954, 1955. Definitely not. In figure 3 you don't identify any low flow days after 1970 until about 1998. Is that right? Mo flows no days with consecutive values below 6,000. Correct. So you talk about this analysis in terms of pre and post-1970's, but there's actually no discernible impact in your analysis until almost 2000. Isn't that right? Mour opinion is that Georgia's consumptive use has caused a fundamental change to the basin over the past 45 years; but that use had no impact with respect to consecutive low flow days, which is the metric we're looking at in figure 3 for the first 30 of those years. Right? Mow, let's look at the pre-1970 period, specifically the period 1950 to 1970. You don't IHE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1976 morning, including these materials. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So am I. MR. SINGARELLA: I guess we're in it together, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: We are. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, this USGS website that we just took a clip out of, this is the same place that you got your underlying data for figure 3. Right? Yes. And what we did was we actually showed you on slide 8 the search that we ran to get the mean daily discharge for 1954 for the Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Is it on this? Yes. You can see the begin data is 1954, January 1? I see it. Okay. Now, turning to slide 9, the next slide SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel, it would be helpful if you used the joint exhibit numbers on these because I don't see them numbered as 8 or 9. MS. ALLON: Your Honor, they should have <u>THE REPORTING GROUP</u>	

		1977			1979
1		a number at the bottom right-hand corner.	1		only the September values for 1954.
2		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I'm sorry.	2	Q.	Even if we were including only the September
3		MS. ALLON: The problem is the JX number	3		values
4		is not going to be very helpful because it's	4	Α.	Yes.
5		not consecutive.	5	Q.	for 1954, we would still have
6		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You're right.	6	Α.	Yes. We would have a larger number in 1955.
7		Thank you.	7	Q.	Yes. And either of those would not have been
8	ΒY	MS. ALLON:	8		reported in your figure 3?
9	Q.	Looking at demonstrative No. 9, Dr. Hornberger,	9	Α.	Correct.
10		you recognize this as the mean daily discharge at	10	Q.	So whether we're working in calendar year or
11		the Chattahoochee Gage as reported by the USGS	11		water year, there are days that meet your
12		for 1954. Right?	12		definition of low flows consecutive days
13	Α.	Yes.	13		that are not reported in your figure 3?
14	Q.	Okay. Now, we highlighted all of the days based	14	Α.	Apparentiv.
15		on your definition of low flows, meaning less	15	Q.	Now, looking at demonstrative No. 10, you will
16		than 6,000 cfs. And would you agree that the	16	-	see that we did the same search from the USGS
17		gage data shows a total of 67 consecutive days	17		website for 1925. Do you see that?
18		below 6,000 cfs for 1954?	18	Α.	Yes. Yes.
19	Α.	Yes.	19	Q.	And if you turn to slide 11, you can see the
20	Q.	Those 67 consecutive days are not reflected on	20		results of that search. You recognize slide 11
21		your figure 3 in your direct testimony; are they?	21		as the mean daily discharge at the Chattahoochee
22	Α.	I believe that the direct testimony referred to	22		Gage for 1925. Right?
23		the period June to September.	23	Α.	Yes, I do.
24	Q.	Let's turn back to figure 3, page 23 of your	24	Q.	Okay. And we have highlighted all of the days
25		direct testimony.	25		based on your definition of low flows. And you
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1978			1980
1		1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3	1		1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days
1 2		1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs	1 2		1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right?
1 2 3		1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that?	1 2 3	А.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4	А.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do.	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony?
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8 ?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I believe that I may have been using water years.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes. Those are all dry years. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I believe that I may have been using water years. Yes. I believe the same criticism would apply,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes. Those are all dry years. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I believe that I may have been using water years. Yes. I believe the same criticism would apply, but I'm happy for you to check the water year	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes. Those are all dry years. Right? Yes. And these low flows at Bainbridge are another budralogie chift that you attribute to Consticute
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? It appears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I believe that I may have been using water years. Yes. I believe the same criticism would apply, but I'm happy for you to check the water year instead of the calendar year.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes. Those are all dry years. Right? Yes. And these low flows at Bainbridge are another hydrologic shift that you attribute to Georgia's concumption uso. Is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? I tappears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I believe that I may have been using water years. Yes. I believe the same criticism would apply, but I'm happy for you to check the water year instead of the calendar year.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes. Those are all dry years. Right? Yes. And these low flows at Bainbridge are another hydrologic shift that you attribute to Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1978 And do you see that the caption of figure 3 says number of consecutive days below 6,000 cfs at Chattahoochee Gage. Do you see that? Yes, I do. Is it your testimony now that in actuality you have only counted and considered in figure 3 consecutive low flow days between June and September? May I look back at my February report, figure 8? Sure. No, I don't I don't qualify it. So turning back to slide 9, you agree there are 67 days in 1954 that meet your definition of low flow days that you did not include in your figure 3 in your direct testimony; is that right? I tappears that way, yes. Let's turn to demonstrative No. 10. Oh. If I can check one more time, I basically tend to work in water years. I think that the same criticism you have would apply, but I believe that I may have been using water years. Yes. I believe the same criticism would apply, but I'm happy for you to check the water year instead of the calendar year. Yes. So I mean, the water year would include IHE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1980 can see there are at least 43 consecutive days below 6,000 cfs in 1925. Right? Yes. And those aren't reflected anywhere in your figure 3 in your direct testimony? Correct. I want to talk about the second set of gage data that you discussed, which is the Bainbridge Gage data. Now, the Bainbridge Gage is on the Flint River above the state line. Right? Yes. And you talk about low flows at the Bainbridge Gage. Right? Yes. You identify six years since 2000 where Bainbridge gage flows fell below 2,500 cfs. Right? Yes. 2002, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2012. Right? Yes. Those are all dry years. Right? Yes. And these low flows at Bainbridge are another hydrologic shift that you attribute to Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? THE REPORTING GROUP Marcon & Lockbert

		1981			1983
1	Α.	Yes.	1		line flows into Florida for the same period.
2	Q.	And you say specifically that these hydrologic	2		That's the blue line. So the analysis that you
3		shifts show impacts to the Apalachicola River in	3		said you didn't do directly, that's what we have
4		Florida. Right?	4		shown here.
5	Α.	Because the Flint River feeds into the	5		Now, as you note in your testimony, flows at
6		Apalachicola River, yes, that's a reasonable	6		Bainbridge, you can see the orange line, are
7		conclusion.	7		below 2,500 cfs for most of May through November.
8	Q.	Now, the Bainbridge gage isn't in Florida.	8		Right?
9		Right?	9	Α.	Yes.
10	Δ.	Correct.	10	Q.	But at the same time as flows at Bainbridge are
11	0	It's in Georgia on the Flint River above the	11	·	below 2 500 cfs. Florida is receiving more than
12	ч.	state line?	12		2 500 cfs at the state line Right?
12	^	State line:	12	٨	Yos I'm I must add I'm not sure what the
13	A.	Correct.	13	Α.	tes. I m I must aud I m not sure what the
14	Q.	But your testimony is that low nows at the	14		blue line is. It says, observed woodruff
15		Bainbridge gage in Georgia snow obvious impacts	15		outflow. So I don't know if that's what the Army
16		to the Apalachicola River in Florida as a result	16		Corps reports or whether it's at the compliance
17		of Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	17		point, which is the Chattahoochee Gage. So I
18	Α.	I think that's a reasonable inference, yes.	18	_	don't know that.
19	Q.	You didn't do any analysis of how low flows on	19	Q.	Okay.
20		the Flint River at Bainbridge compare with flows	20	Α.	But it's certainly higher.
21		entering the Apalachicola River in Florida. Did	21	Q.	And you can see that in June, for example and
22		you?	22		this is in the yellow circle on the left
23	Α.	So compare the flows at Bainbridge with the flows	23		Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs. Right?
24		in the Apalachicola itself?	24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	Yes.	25	Q.	There is no corresponding decrease in state line
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1982			1984
4		Cash of like a disect			flaway is there?
	А.	Sort of like a direct comparison?	1		nows; is there?
2	A. Q.	Sort of like a direct comparison? Yes.	1 2	Α.	There is no decrease in the blue line.
2 3	A. Q. A.	Sort of like a direct comparison? Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis.	1 2 3	A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge
2 3 4	А. Q. А. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data.	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right?
2 3 4 5	А. Q. А. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	А. Q. А. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line
2 3 4 5 6 7	А. Q. А. Q. А.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. Q. Q. A.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. Q. Q. Д.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А. Q. A. Q. А.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well. we can turn to your direct, if that would	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helnful.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okav.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows: is there?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the ton. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 20, which is on the screen	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Bicht?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 30, which is on the screen, and it's plage in the back under the demonstration	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Right? Yes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 30, which is on the screen, and it's also in the back under the demonstrative	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Right? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 30, which is on the screen, and it's also in the back under the demonstrative slides, what we did is we plotted your Bainbridge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding increase in state line flows: is there? No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 30, which is on the screen, and it's also in the back under the demonstrative slides, what we did is we plotted your Bainbridge gage data with the same data for 2012. That's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding increase in state line flows; is there? Mol.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 30, which is on the screen, and it's also in the back under the demonstrative slides, what we did is we plotted your Bainbridge gage data with the same data for 2012. That's the orange line. And we also plotted the state	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding increase in state line flows; is there? Well, the graph ends; so I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. No, I don't recall doing an explicit analysis. All right. Well, let's take a look at that data. One of the years that you looked at in your Bainbridge analysis is 2012. Right? Yes. And you say that in 2012 flows at Bainbridge were below 2,500 cfs for eight months straight from May to December. Right? Yes. Let's take a look at Now, of course, I may have been talking about monthly average flows there. Well, we can turn to your direct, if that would be helpful. Okay. It's page 19, paragraph 47. Yes. It says monthly average flow right at the top. Yes. Now, turning to slide 30, which is on the screen, and it's also in the back under the demonstrative slides, what we did is we plotted your Bainbridge gage data with the same data for 2012. That's the orange line. And we also plotted the state THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	There is no decrease in the blue line. And then you see there's a spike in Bainbridge flows in mid-June. Right? Yes. There's no corresponding increase in state line flows in mid-June; is there? Not on the blue line. Let's go over to the other yellow circle. And actually, you see in October there's a little spike at the beginning of October; and you do see a small spike in state line flows, too. Right? In the blue line, yes. But then Bainbridge flows drop below 2,000 cfs again toward the middle of October. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding decrease in state line flows; is there? No. And then in early November there's a spike in Bainbridge flows. Right? Yes. There is no corresponding increase in state line flows; is there? Well, the graph ends; so I don't know. THE REPORTING GROUP

Г

		1985			1987
1	Q.	In early November right where there is a spike	1		low flows. Right?
2	Α.	Oh, November. I'm sorry. I thought I went to	2	Α.	Yes.
3		the end of the graph. November, not December.	3	Q.	Now, you didn't actually run a groundwater model
4		Yes, I see that.	4		to study the impact of groundwater pumping in
5	Q.	Okay. So let me just ask my question again so we	5		Spring Creek. Right?
6		have it clear for the record.	6	Α.	I did not.
7		In early November where there is a spike in	7	Q.	You also talk about the interaction between
8		Bainbridge flows, there is no corresponding	8		surface water and groundwater in Spring Creek.
9		increase in state line flows; is that correct?	9		Right?
10	Α.	Correct.	10	Α.	Yes.
11		MS. ALLON: Your Honor, I'm about to	11	Q.	You didn't do any calculations of groundwater and
12		start a new section. I would be happy to	12		surface water interaction in Spring Creek. Did
13		take a break now if it's convenient for the	13		you?
14		Court, or I would be happy to wait until	14	Α.	No.
15		after the next section.	15	Q.	You didn't compare any data on groundwater
16		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Can you give	16		pumping in Spring Creek to streamflow data in
17		me an estimate of how much longer you will be	17		Spring Creek to see if you could establish a
18		with Dr. Hornberger?	18		correlation between groundwater pumping and low
19		MS ALLON: For the entire	19		flows Right?
20		cross-examination? I would estimate about	20	Δ	Right
21		another hour-and-a-half to two hours	21	0	You didn't do any analysis to determine whether
22		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER · We'll take a	22	ч.	the low flows at Spring Creek were a local
23		break	23		nhenomenon that did not have any impact
23		MS ALLON: Thank you	23		downstream Right?
25		(Time Noted: 10:17 a.m.)	25	۸	That sounds to me like an absurdity because water
25			25	Α.	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		1086			1088
1		(Recess Called)	1		flows downhill. And so if it's not flowing at
2		(Time Noted: 10:30 a m.)	2		Iron City. I don't see how it could be
2		(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.)	2		Iron City, I don't see how it could be
2 3 4		(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may	2 3 4		Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make
2 3 4 5		(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS ALLON: Thank you your Honor	2 3 4 5	0.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense.
2 3 4 5 6	BY	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON:	2 3 4 5 6	Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an
2 3 4 5 6 7	BY I	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Homberger, before the break we were talking	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Analachicola River in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY Q .	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about bydrologic shift in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Elorida Richt?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACE Basin: and we were talking about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BY Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Analachicola River, it certainly is an indicator
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BY Q.	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And L want to turn to the third set, which is the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact ves
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ВҮ Q.	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ВҮ Q .	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ВҮ Q .	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ВҮ Q.	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ВҮ Q.	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ВҮ Q .	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q.	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ВҮ Q . Q .	<pre>(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct?</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ВҮ Q. Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 920	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	вү і Q. Q. А.	 (Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. I would have to look that up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	вү Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes. Spring Creek is a tributary off the Flint River. Binbt2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. I would have to look that up. The Corps the Army Corps controls releases into Florida from Lake Seminole for its operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	ΒΥ Q. Q. A. Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes. Spring Creek is a tributary off the Flint River. Right? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. I would have to look that up. The Corps the Army Corps controls releases into Florida from Lake Seminole for its operation of Woodruff Dam. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ВҮ Q. A. Q. A. Q.	<pre>(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes. Spring Creek is a tributary off the Flint River. Right? Yes.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. I would have to look that up. The Corps the Army Corps controls releases into Florida from Lake Seminole for its operation of Woodruff Dam. Right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ВҮ Q. Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	<pre>(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes. Spring Creek is a tributary off the Flint River. Right? Yes. And with respect to Spring Creek, you talk about the impact of Georgia's groundwater sumption on</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. I would have to look that up. The Corps the Army Corps controls releases into Florida from Lake Seminole for its operation of Woodruff Dam. Right? Right. The Army releases water from Jim Woodruff Dam. That's what flows down into the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ВҮ Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek is a tributary off the Flint River. Right? Yes. And with respect to Spring Creek, you talk about the impact of Georgia's groundwater pumping on THE REPORTING CROUP	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. I would have to look that up. The Corps the Army Corps controls releases into Florida from Lake Seminole for its operation of Woodruff Dam. Right? Right. The Army releases water from Jim Woodruff Dam. That's what flows down into the Apalachicola, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ВҮ Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	(Time Noted: 10:30 a.m.) SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor. MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, before the break we were talking about your opinions about hydrologic shift in the ACF Basin; and we were talking about the three sets of gage data that you looked at. And I want to turn to the third set, which is the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Now, let's turn to page 12 of your direct testimony. And I want to look specifically at figure 2. Now, this is a map from your direct testimony. Right? Yes. And it shows, you can see, the Iron City Gage for Spring Creek. Correct? Yes. Spring Creek is a tributary off the Flint River. Right? Yes. And with respect to Spring Creek, you talk about the impact of Georgia's groundwater pumping on THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockbart	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Iron City, I don't see how it could be inconsequential downstream. That doesn't make any hydrological sense. Your testimony is that the low flows observed at the Iron City Gage in Spring Creek have an obvious impact to the Apalachicola River in Florida. Right? As as an input one of the inputs to the Apalachicola River, it certainly is an indicator of impact, yes. Spring Creek doesn't flow directly into Florida; does it? It does not. Okay. It flows into the Flint River. Then it flows into Lake Seminole and the Army Corps reservoir. Right? It may actually flow directly into the Army Corps reservoir. Right? The Corps the Army Corps controls releases into Florida from Lake Seminole for its operation of Woodruff Dam. Right? Right. The Army releases water from Jim Woodruff Dam. That's what flows down into the Apalachicola, yes. THE REPORTING GROUP Magen & Lockbert

		1989			1991
1	Q.	You're not offering the opinion that a decline in	1		you don't show on this map any other gages in
2		flows at one gage on a tributary of the Flint	2		Spring Creek. Do you?
3		River translates to an equal or corresponding	3	Α.	I do not.
4		decline in state line flows; are you?	4	Q.	Okay. But there are other gages in Spring Creek.
5	Α.	No. It's an indicator.	5		Right?
6	Q.	And you didn't do anything to quantify the impact	6	Α.	I believe there is at least one upstream gage.
7		of Spring Creek flows on total state line flows	7	Q.	Let's look at slide 14. I'll put it on the
8		into Florida; did you?	8		screen, and it's also going to be the slide
9	Α.	In terms of a direct comparison as we were	9		numbered 14 beyond the demonstrative tab in your
10		talking about earlier, no.	10		binder.
11	Q.	And as a result, you don't know how much or how	11		And what we did in slide 14 is we actually
12	<u> </u>	little flows from Spring Creek influence flows at	12		just took your man from your direct, but we added
13		the state line Right?	13		the Reynoldsville Gage which you can see is
14	Δ	No. That was as I said it's an indicator	14		immediately downstream of the Iron City Gage at
15	<i>.</i>	It's not my contention that there's a direct	15		Spring Creek Right?
16		connection.	16	Δ	It is downstream of it ves
17	0	You're familiar with the terms gaining reach and	17	0	You don't know whether the the Devnoldsville
19	<u>ч</u>	losing reach Right?	19	ς.	Gane has ever experienced zero flow Dight?
10	Δ		10	Δ	Ob I would doubt that The Poweldsville Case
19 20	0	A gaining reach refers to a stream that overall	20	А.	is affected by what we refer to as a backwater
20 24	ખ.	has more flow downstream than it does unstream	20		offact from Laka Sominals itself
∠ I 22		nas more now downstream than it does upstream. Right?	21	0	So as a part of your analysis of what you call
22 22	^	Nght:	22	હ.	low flows in Spring Crook, you didate consider
∠3 24	A.	It means as it flows down, it's spining water?	23		flows at the Poyneldsville Cases did you?
24	Q. ∧	The means as it nows down, it's gaining water?	24		
25	А.		25	А.	
		ITE KEPUKTING GKUUP			
		· =			
	~	1990		~	1992
1	Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has	1	Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has
1 2	Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does	1	Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions?
1 2 3	Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right?	1 2 3	Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me.
1 2 3 4	Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4	Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012
1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	1992And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions?That would not surprise me.Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage?The inflection, right? That's correct.And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right?As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. - right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions?That would not surprise me.Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage?The inflection, right? That's correct.And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right?As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question.Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring Creek. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions?That would not surprise me.Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage?The inflection, right? That's correct.And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right?As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question.Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a gaining reach. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring Creek. Right? I did not.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a gaining reach. Right? They would be for gages on a free-flowing river,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring Creek. Right? I did not. Okay. Let's go back to your map on figure 2,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a gaining reach. Right? They would be for gages on a free-flowing river, not a gage that is partially affected by a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring Creek. Right? I did not. Okay. Let's go back to your map on figure 2, page 12 of your direct testimony. And, again, if	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a gaining reach. Right? They would be for gages on a free-flowing river, not a gage that is partially affected by a backwater from a reservoir.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring Creek. Right? I did not. Okay. Let's go back to your map on figure 2, page 12 of your direct testimony. And, again, if we look at the Iron City Gage on Spring Creek,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a gaining reach. Right? They would be for gages on a free-flowing river, not a gage that is partially affected by a backwater from a reservoir. So your testimony is you cannot use the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1990 And a losing reach refers to a stream that has overall less flow downstream than it does upstream. Right? Yes. It means as it flows, it's losing water Yes. right? You didn't do any analysis as to whether Spring Creek was a gaining or losing reach overall; did you? An analysis I mean, I looked at reports; but I, myself, did not do any calculations or analysis. And your analysis of Spring Creek in your direct testimony is limited to one gage at the Iron City Gage. Right? Yes. You didn't do anything to determine whether the flows you observed at that single gage at Iron City actually occurred at other gages in Spring Creek. Right? I did not. Okay. Let's go back to your map on figure 2, page 12 of your direct testimony. And, again, if we look at the Iron City Gage on Spring Creek, THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1992 And are you aware that the Reynoldsville Gage has never measured zero flow conditions? That would not surprise me. Even in the drought years of 2007, 2011, and 2012 that you point to with respect to your analysis of the Iron City Gage? The inflection, right? That's correct. And that means because Reynoldsville Gage has never reported zero flows during all of the low flow conditions that you point to at the Iron City Gage, Spring Creek was still a gaining reach. Right? As I said, the Reynoldsville Gage I believe is affected by Lake Seminole. So I would have to really do a very careful analysis to answer that question. Well, Dr. Hornberger, before you said that a gaining reach was pretty simple. If there was more flow downstream than upstream, it was a gaining reach. Right? They would be for gages on a free-flowing river, not a gage that is partially affected by a backwater from a reservoir. So your testimony is you cannot use the THE REPORTING GROUP

TRIAL - November	10,	2016	(Vol.	VIII)
------------------	-----	------	-------	-------

		1993			1995
1		definition of gaining reaches and losing reaches	1		cfs difference in streamflow between the two sets
2		that you just testified to with respect to the	2		of droughts is Georgia's consumptive use. Right?
3		two gages on Spring Creek?	3	Α.	Yes.
4	Δ.	I could not do it with respect to a gage that is	4	Q.	But it's also true that the 1954 to 1955 drought
5		affected by materially affected by reservoir	5		is before there were any reservoirs in the ACF
6		And I believe that the Peypoldsville Gage is so	6		Basin and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after the
7		affected	7		reconvoirs were built. Ice't that right?
<i>'</i>	0	Allected.		•	
8	ц.	You don't have any discussion in your direct	8	A.	tes.
9		testimony about the Reynoldsville Gage or any	9	Q.	You don't dispute that the federal reservoirs in
10		analysis about how it might be affected by a	10		the ACF Basin have some influence on how much
11	_	reservoir; do you?	11		water flows through to Florida at the state line;
12	Α.	No.	12		do you?
13	Q.	Now, the second basis for your opinion about	13	Α.	No.
14		hydrological shifts in the ACF Basin is this	14	Q.	But you attribute the entire difference in
15		analysis you did of recent versus historic	15		streamflow between the 1954 to 1955 drought and
16		droughts. Right?	16		the 2011 to 2012 drought to Georgia's consumptive
17	Α.	In what sense? Can you be more specific?	17		use. Right?
18	Q.	One hydrologic shift that you attribute to	18	Α.	Yes. We have looked at the impact of the
19		Georgia's consumptive use is your observation	19		reservoirs in terms of the evaporation from the
20		that recent droughts have caused greater	20		reservoirs, and it is a small amount.
21		streamflow decline than historic droughts.	21	Q.	There is no discussion in your direct testimony
22		Correct?	22		of any analysis ruling out the reservoirs as a
23	Δ.	Correct	23		possible interpretation for any of the difference
24	Q.	And you say you attribute the difference in	24		in streamflow between the two droughts; is there?
25	ч.	streamflows between the earlier drought and the	25	Δ	You're right
23			23		
		Mason & Lookbart			Mason & Lockbart
		Mason & Lockhan			
		4004			1000
_		1994		•	1996
1		1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use.	1	Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and
1 2	_	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	1 2	Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin
1 2 3	Α.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes.	1 2 3	Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct	1 2 3 4	Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use;	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3.500 to 4.000 cfs between streamflow in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin: did you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought? Yes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin; did you? I did not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought? Yes. And because you say that you rule out climate as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin; did you? I did not.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought? Yes. And because you say that you rule out climate as a pageible cause, your opinion is that the approximately	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin; did you? I did not. Let's look at the analysis you did do. It's on page 27 of your direct testimeny at table 4
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought? Yes. And because you say that you rule out climate as a possible cause, your opinion is that the only	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin; did you? I did not. Let's look at the analysis you did do. It's on page 27 of your direct testimony at table 4.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought? Yes. And because you say that you rule out climate as a possible cause, your opinion is that the only remaining interpretation for that 3,500 to 4,000	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin; did you? I did not. Let's look at the analysis you did do. It's on page 27 of your direct testimony at table 4. In table 4 on page 27 in the middle column
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1994 more recent drought to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Yes. Now, let's look at page 20 of your direct testimony and specifically at table 1. In table 1 you're comparing two sets of back-to-back drought years. Right? Yes. 1954 and 1955 on the one hand and 2011 and 2012 on the other hand? Yes. And you say, not in table 11 but in the text right around it, that the 1954 to 1955 drought is before the growth in Georgia's consumptive use; and the 2011 to 2012 drought is after there have already been moderate consumptive use levels. Right? Yes. And you observed a difference of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 cfs between streamflow in the earlier drought and the later drought? Yes. And because you say that you rule out climate as a possible cause, your opinion is that the only remaining interpretation for that 3,500 to 4,000 THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1996 Let's talk about what you call basin yield, and that's another shift that you identify. Basin yield is essentially the amount of precipitation that ultimately becomes streamflow. Right? It's the yes, the fraction of rainfall over a basin that flows out as streamflow, yes. And you say that basin yield has declined in the ACF Basin. Right? Yes. And you say the cause of that decline is Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. And for this opinion you only looked at basin yield changes at a single gage. Right? Yes. And that was the Chattahoochee Gage just below the state line. Right? Yes. You didn't do any analysis of how basin yield might have changed in rivers outside the ACF Basin; did you? I did not. Let's look at the analysis you did do. It's on page 27 of your direct testimony at table 4. In table 4 on page 27 in the middle column THE REPORTING GROUP

		1997			1999
1		that says basin yield, you report your basin	1		one picks. And so if you pick a period such as
2		yield numbers. Is that right?	2		1970 to 1999, you're not capturing a
3	Α.	Yes.	3		representative set of both wet and dry years.
4	Q.	I want to turn to demonstrative No. 23. Now,	4		And so the periods that I picked, if one looks at
5		Dr. Hornberger, in your original report that you	5		the precipitation record, all have a balance
6		submitted on February 29, 2016, your basin yield	6		between wet and dry years. And so it's not
7		values were .349, .330, .296, and .261. Is that	7		really a good calculation to just pick out a
8		right?	8		section where the basin yield is high because you
9	Α.	That's what the table says, yes.	9		don't have a representative set of wet and dry
10	Q.	And you later revised your basin yield numbers in	10		years.
11		a July 19, 2016, supplemental memorandum. And	11	Q.	All of the data sets that you chose to pick out
12		there you reported that your basin yield numbers	12		and report to this Court all show a decline in
13		were .343, .328, .301, and .282. Is that right?	13		the basin yield: is that right?
14	Α.	Yes.	14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	And now in your direct testimony that you	15	Q.	Now let's look at table 5 in your direct. It's
16		submitted to the Court a few weeks ago, your	16		on page 28 And page 28 of your direct on table
17		basin yield numbers are 329 316 289 and	17		5 also discusses basin vield Right?
18		270 Isn't that right?	18	Δ	
19	Δ	Vec	19	0	Table 5 is basin yield presented by year in order
20	0	For today. I'm just going to work off of the most	20	~ .	of lowest basin yield Right?
21	~ .	recent set of numbers from your direct testimony	21	Δ	
22		so the table 4 that's reproduced at the bottom of	22		MS ALLON: Your Honor I'm sorry I'm back
23		this slide And you show average appual basis	23		in Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony
23		vield numbers for four periods 1924 to 1970	23		SPECIAL MASTER ANCASTER: Thank you
25		1971 to 2013, 1992 to 2013, and 2003 to 2013. Is	25		MS_ALLON: On page 20
23			25		
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockbart
		Maddin a Eddiniart			
		1998			2000
1		1998	1	BY	2000 MS. ALLON:
1	Α.	1998 that right? Yes.	1	ВҮ Q .	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years
1 2 3	A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report	1 2 3	вү Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right?
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent	1 2 3 4	вү Q. А .	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts: isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5	BY Q. A.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6	ΒΥ Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	вү Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ΒΥ Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Bight?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ΒΥ Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. А. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ВҮ Q. Q. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ВҮ Q. Q. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	вү Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	вү Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Yaguely.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ВҮ Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ВҮ Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that? That is the calculation you showed me, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the backup sheet that was produced to Georgia along
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that? That is the calculation you showed me, yes. So while your data showed an overall decline for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ВҮ Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the backup sheet that was produced to Georgia along with your direct testimony supporting table 5.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that? That is the calculation you showed me, yes. So while your data showed an overall decline for 1971 to 2013, it actually showed an increase for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ВҮ Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the backup sheet that was produced to Georgia along with your direct testimony supporting table 5. Now, according to your backup data. in 1932
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that? That is the calculation you showed me, yes. So while your data showed an overall decline for 1971 to 2013, it actually showed an increase for the first 30 years of that period. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ΒΥ Q . Q . 	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the backup sheet that was produced to Georgia along with your direct testimony supporting table 5. Now, according to your backup data, in 1932 there was a basin yield of 25.7 percent. Is that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that? That is the calculation you showed me, yes. So while your data showed an overall decline for 1971 to 2013, it actually showed an increase for the first 30 years of that period. Right? Yes. One really needs to be careful what periods	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the backup sheet that was produced to Georgia along with your direct testimony supporting table 5. Now, according to your backup data, in 1932 there was a basin yield of 25.7 percent. Is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	1998 that right? Yes. All three of the sets of data where you report post-1970 include and reflect data from recent droughts; isn't that right? Yes. There's no subset in your analysis reported here that would show a period of basin yield that did not include a major drought. Right? That's right. I think there are droughts included in all of those periods. Now, you recall at your deposition we had gone back to the underlying data so that we could see actually what it showed for some of the subsets that you didn't report. Do you recall that? Vaguely. And you agreed at your deposition that the basin yield data that you relied on for your analysis actually showed an increase in basin yield over the period of 1971 to 1998. Do you recall that? That is the calculation you showed me, yes. So while your data showed an overall decline for 1971 to 2013, it actually showed an increase for the first 30 years of that period. Right? Yes. One really needs to be careful what periods THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2000 MS. ALLON: Now, in table 5 you include a selection of years with lowest basin yield at the top. Right? Yes. And the basin yields that you present in table 5 range from 13.9 percent to 39.9 percent. Right? Yes. And, again, in the text discussing this table, you contrast pre-and-post 1970 basin yields. Right? Yes. And you agree that the low basin yield values before 1970 are not associated with Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. Now, let's turn to demonstrative No. 24. And in demonstrative 24 what we have done is on the left, we have reproduced the table 5 from your direct that we were just looking at. And on the right, we have reproduced the data from the backup sheet that was produced to Georgia along with your direct testimony supporting table 5. Now, according to your backup data, in 1932 there was a basin yield of 25.7 percent. Is that right? THE REPORTING GROUP

Г

		2001			2003
1	Α.	1932. I can't find 19 in my direct testimony?	1		in the Flint River Basin identified by Gordon, et
2	Q.	In the backup data.	2		al., 2012. Is that right?
3	Α.	Oh, the backup data.	3	Α.	Yes.
4		1932, yes, okay. So what is 1932?	4	Q.	Okay. The red and yellow lines show losing and
5	Q.	There was a basin yield of 25.7 percent. That's	5		dry stream reaches. Right?
6		what you reported in your backup data?	6	Α.	Yes.
7	Α.	I see that.	7	Q.	And you believe that this phenomenon is caused by
8	Q.	That's not listed under your table 5 in your	8		groundwater pumping in Georgia altering the
9		direct; is it?	9		natural hydrology. Right?
10	Α.	No, it is not.	10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	According to your backup data in 1941, there was	11	Q.	Now, you say that figure 5 was prepared by
12		a basin yield of 22.6 percent; isn't that right?	12		adapting figure 13 in the Gordon article. Right?
13	Α.	Yes.	13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	That's not listed in your table 5 in your direct:	14	Q.	Let's take a look at the Gordon article. It's
15		is it?	15		JX-54. And if you turn to page 22, you will see
16	Α.	I believe it is, about halfway down.	16		the figure 13 that you referred to.
17	Q.	You're right	17	Δ.	Could you tell me the page again?
18	Ξ.	Let's look at 1963 According to your backup	18	Q.	Page 22
19		data there was a basin yield of 26.9 percent in	19		Dr. Hornberger, figure 13 on page 22 is the
20		1963 Is that right?	20		figure that your figure 5 that we just looked at
20	Δ	Vec	20		is adapted from _ Pight2
21	0	Okay That's not reported on your table 5 is	21	Δ	Give me a minute nlease
22	ч.		22	0	Suro
23	Δ	Tt is not	23	Δ.	Ves Thelieve so
24	<u> </u>	And according to your backup data, there was a	24	<u> </u>	Now I want to actually compare your figure 5 and
25	ω.		25	α.	
		Mason & Lockbart			Mason & Lockhart
		2002			2004
		2002			
4		bacin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Icp't that	1		Cordon figure 13 So on slide 25 I have
1		basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that	1		Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have
1 2 2	٨	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right?	1 2 3		Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side
1 2 3	Α.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes.	1 2 3		Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side.
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it?	1 2 3 4		Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not.	1 2 3 4 5		Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about which is groundwater level.	1 2 3 4 5 6		Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	RV	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ВҮ Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BY Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	вү Q. А.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ВҮ Q. A. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BY Q. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	вү Q. Q. A.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ВҮ Q . Q . Q . Q .	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. A.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	вү Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map from an article that was written by Gordon in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map from an article that was written by Gordon in 2012. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right? Yes. Okay. You didn't include those losing and dry
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map from an article that was written by Gordon in 2012. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right? Yes. Okay. You didn't include those losing and dry reaches in your figure 5; did you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map from an article that was written by Gordon in 2012. Is that right? Yes. Okay. If we look at figure 5 on page 31, the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right? Yes. Okay. You didn't include those losing and dry reaches in your figure 5; did you? No. We were concentrating on the Flint River
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map from an article that was written by Gordon in 2012. Is that right? Yes. Okay. If we look at figure 5 on page 31, the caption of figure 5 says, losing stream reaches	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ΒΥ Q . A . Q . A . Q . A . Q . A . Q . A .	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right? Yes. Okay. You didn't include those losing and dry reaches in your figure 5; did you? No. We were concentrating on the Flint River Basin.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	basin yield in 1969 of 24.3 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. That's not listed in your table 5 either; is it? It is not. Now let's talk about the final hydrologic shift that you talk about, which is groundwater level declines. Your opinion is that groundwater pumping has altered the natural hydrology of the Lower Flint River Basin; is that right? Yes. And if we turn to your direct testimony on page 29 at paragraph 68, you say that groundwater declines are causing streams that historically gained water from groundwater, called gaining streams, to actually lose stream load to the groundwater and thus are becoming losing streams. Do you see that? Yes. Now, your related figure 4 on page 31 shows a map from an article that was written by Gordon in 2012. Is that right? Yes. Okay. If we look at figure 5 on page 31, the caption of figure 5 says, losing stream reaches THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Gordon figure 13. So on slide 25, I have prepared a demonstrative where I just put the figures up side by side. MS. ALLON: I'm I'm sorry, it's slide 26. But if you're looking in the hard copy, it may say 25 in the bottom right-hand corner. MS. ALLON: All right. Now, the figure on the left is your figure 5 from your testimony. Right? Yes. Okay. And the figure on the right is the Gordon article that you cite to. Right? Yes. Now, you see in the basin next to the Flint, east of the Flint, there is a river called the Ochlockonee River? Yes. And in that basin, in the Gordon article there are some losing and dry reaches. Right? Yes. Okay. You didn't include those losing and dry reaches in your figure 5; did you? No. We were concentrating on the Flint River Basin. THE REPORTING GROUP

		2005			2007
1	Q.	Now, it's not labeled on the Gordon map, but the	1	Α.	In large part, yes.
2		river to the west of the Apalachicola River is	2	Q.	Now, for your rainfall runoff model you used the
3		the Chipola River. Right?	3		USGS P R M S, or PRMS, model that had already
4	Α.	Yes.	4		been developed by USGS for analysis of the ACF
5	Q.	And you can see on Gordon figure 13 that there's	5		Basin. Right?
6	_ .	a section along the Chinola River that was also	6	Δ	Ves
7		identified by the Cordon authors as a losing	7	0	When LISGS developed its PRMS model, it also
, ,		reach Dight2	6	હ.	collibrated the model to observed flows in the ACE
0	•		0		
9	A.		9	•	Basin. Right?
10	Q.	That's not reflected in your figure 5 either; is	10	А.	Yes.
11		it?	11	Q.	Calibration is important because it helps ensure
12	Α.	No. We were focused on the Flint River	12		that models provide reliable estimates. Right?
13		basically.	13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	Now, the Apalachicola portion is actually a	14	Q.	Now, you redid the USGS's calibration. Right?
15		little bit hard to see in figure 13. So the	15	Α.	Yes.
16		article the Gordon article, the authors	16	Q.	So I'm going to refer to your recalibrated PRMS
17		extended it to the next page. So if you turn to	17		model as your PRMS model so that we can
18		the next slide, again I just compared your figure	18		distinguish it from the USGS PRMS model. Okay?
19		5 with the Gordon figure that blows up, so to	19	Α.	Okay.
20		speak, the portion of the Apalachicola River.	20	Q.	Your PRMS model was developed specifically for
21		And figure 13 from Gordon shows that portions of	21		this litigation. Right?
22		the Apalachicola River are losing reaches, too.	22	Α.	Yes.
23		Right?	23	Q.	You have never calculated the PRMS model before
24	Α.	Yes.	24		this litigation. Right?
25	Q.	Okay And those aren't reflected in your	25	Δ.	Not the specific PRMS model, no.
	۹.			7.1	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
					Mason a Eookhart
		2006			2009
		2006		0	2008
1	•	2006 figure 5 either. Right?	1	Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the
1 2	Α.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct.	1 2	Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already
1 2 3	A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You	1 2 3	Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that	1 2 3 4	Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's	1 2 3 4 5	Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes. And you say that the difference between those two	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you did was you compared the PRMS modeled results
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes. And you say that the difference between those two numbers, your modeled value of what flows would	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you did was you compared the PRMS modeled results with observed data so that you could see how well
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes. And you say that the difference between those two numbers, your modeled value of what flows would have been and your observed value of what flows	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you did was you compared the PRMS modeled results with observed data so that you could see how well the two sets matched. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes. And you say that the difference between those two numbers, your modeled value of what flows would have been and your observed value of what flows actually were, is attributable to Georgia's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you did was you compared the PRMS modeled results with observed data so that you could see how well the two sets matched. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes. And you say that the difference between those two numbers, your modeled value of what flows would have been and your observed value of what flows actually were, is attributable to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you did was you compared the PRMS modeled results with observed data so that you could see how well the two sets matched. Right? Yes. And the goal is to get as close a match as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2006 figure 5 either. Right? That's correct. Let's talk about your rainfall runoff model. You wanted to quantify the streamflow depletions that you believe have been caused by Georgia's consumptive use. Is that right? Yes. Now, what a rainfall runoff model does is it tells you how much streamflow there will be based on rainfall, temperature, and other climatic factors. Right? Yes. So you use a rainfall runoff model to forecast what streamflows would have been with minimal human impact. Right? Yes. And then you compared what your rainfall runoff model forecast flows would have been with what flows actually were. Right? Yes. And you say that the difference between those two numbers, your modeled value of what flows would have been and your observed value of what flows actually were, is attributable to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2008 Well, in fact, as an expert consultant in the past, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and then recalibrated it yourself. Right? Since I have never been involved in litigation before, that is absolutely true. But even in your work as an expert consultant outside the context of litigation, you have never taken a model that's already been calibrated, decided you weren't satisfied with the calibration, and recalibrated it yourself. Have you? That's a very broad question. I would have to think about that. I believe that I have worked with students who have calibrated models and then gone back and redone a calibration. So I think that in a general sense, I have to not agree with you on that. Well, when you did your recalibration, what you did was you compared the PRMS modeled results with observed data so that you could see how well the two sets matched. Right? Yes. And the goal is to get as close a match as

Г

		2009			2011
1		possible between modeled results and observed	1	Α.	There are differences. I would not characterize
2		data during your calibration period?	2		them as substantial. I, as a hydrologist, would
3	Α.	Yes.	3		look at this figure and think that it is quite a
4	Q.	Okay. Now, let's take a look at the result of	4		good fit.
5		your PRMS recalibration. You didn't include them	5	Q.	All right. Well, let's look at a couple of
6		in your direct, so we'll have to go back to your	6		examples. If you look in early 1936, do you see
7		expert report. They're at FX-785, page 68.	7		a sharp spike there?
8		Now, figure A.4 on page 68 shows the results	8	Α.	Yes.
9		of your calibration for your PRMS model. Right?	9	Q.	Okay. That reflects a difference of at least
10	Α.	Figure A.5 you're pointing to?	10		20,000 cfs between modeled and observed. Right?
11	Q.	A.4.	11	Α.	My eye is probably not that finely calibrated,
12	Α.	A.4, yes.	12		but certainly there is a difference.
13	Q.	Now, the red line shows modeled flows from your	13	Q.	Let's look at early 1938. Do you see a sharp
14		PRMS model. Right?	14		spike there?
15	Α.	Yes.	15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	The blue line shows observed flows from the	16	Q.	And that also shows a difference between modeled
17		Chattahoochee Gage.	17		and observed of at least 20,000 cfs. Right?
18	Α.	Yes.	18	Α.	Probably, yes.
19	Q.	And what the figure 4 A.4 does is it shows a	19	Q.	Now, the difference between modeled and observed
20		comparison between modeled and observed for the	20		in the calibration period is not a result of
21		period 1935 to 1940. Right?	21		Georgia's consumptive use. Right?
22	Α.	Yes.	22	Α.	Right.
23	Q.	Okay. The X axis is the water year. Right?	23	Q.	And the difference that exists in the calibration
24	Α.	Yes.	24		period similarly exists in the post-1955 period.
25	Q.	And that just means that instead of the calendar	25		Right?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2010			2012
1		2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to	1	Α.	2012 Yes.
1		2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right?	1 2	A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference
1 2 3	А.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes.	1 2 3	A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year.	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy.	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs.	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А. Q. А. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	А. Q. А. Q. А.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are times where the modeled flows are substantially	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. A.	2012 Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. In such andel, one can't attribute go
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are times where the modeled flows are substantially different from the observed flows. There can be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. A.	2012Yes.Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt.That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use.Right?Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling.Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use?Yes. In such a model, one can't attribute go to any given day and attribute what the to any size on the such a model tells when the to any given day and attribute what the to any given day and attribute what the to any given day and stribute what the to any given day and attribute what the to any given day and stribute what the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are times where the modeled flows are substantially different from the observed flows. There can be differences between your modeled results and your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. A.	Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. In such a model, one can't attribute go to any given day and attribute what the difference between model and modeled and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are times where the modeled flows are substantially different from the observed flows. There can be differences between your modeled results and your observed flows of several thousands of cfs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q.	2012Yes.Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right?There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt.That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use.Right?Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling.Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use?Yes. In such a model, one can't attribute go to any given day and attribute what the difference between model and modeled and observed data. You can't you can't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are times where the modeled flows are substantially different from the observed flows. There can be differences between your modeled results and your observed flows of several thousands of cfs. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us - the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. In such a model, one can't attribute go to any given day and attribute what the difference between model and modeled and observed data. You can't you can't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2010 year, the water year goes from October 1 to September 30. Right? Yes. It's a hydrologist's version of a fiscal year. Good analogy. Now, the Y axis is the flow or discharge in cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the Y axis scale looks like it goes from zero to 2. But you see there is a notation at the top over there that says times 10 to the 5th power. That means that the scale actually goes from zero to 200,000 cfs. Right? Yes. Now, the time period that you reflect in figure A.4, the calibration period, is the time period during which your modelled results should most closely match the observed data. Right? Yes. However, for your calibration period, there are times where the modeled flows are substantially different from the observed flows. There can be differences between your modeled results and your observed flows of several thousands of cfs. Right? THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Meaning there will always be some difference between your modeled and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? There will always be some differences in modeled results on a day-to-day basis, without a doubt. That are not due to Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Well, Georgia's consumptive use is not even included in the model. So all the model tells us - the model tells us these differences. And you're right; we infer that over a long period the average of those differences give a clear indication of hydrologic change. That was the purpose of the modeling. Dr. Hornberger, is it fair to say that in your post-1955 period, there will always be some difference between your modeled results and observed results that is not due to Georgia's consumptive use? Yes. In such a model, one can't attribute go to any given day and attribute what the difference between model and modeled and observed data. You can't - you can't desegregate at that level.

		2013			2015
1	Q.	Why don't you take a look at your deposition	1	Α.	Yes.
2		transcript on page 326.	2	Q.	But you told me at your deposition that
3		MS. ALLON: And I would like to ask	3		if I wanted the detailed answer to how
4		Mr. Smith to play clip 93.	4		Dr. Flewelling's estimates are conservative,
5		(Whereupon the video was played.)	5		I needed to ask Dr. Flewelling myself. Right?
6	BY I	MS. ALLON:	6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	Were you asked that question, and did you give	7	Q.	You told me Dr. Flewelling is a much better
8		that answer?	8		source to ask questions about consumptive use.
9	Α.	Yes.	9		Right?
10		MS. ALLON: I'm about to start two	10	Α.	Yes. He did the calculations.
11		sections of my cross-examination that relate	11	Q.	Now, in addition to adopting Dr. Flewelling's
12		to testimony that Dr. Hornberger has adopted	12		consumptive use opinions, you also use his
13		from other Florida experts. Now, these	13		estimates as inputs in your modeling. Right?
14		opinions are the subject of a letter that was	14	Α.	Yes.
15		sent to your Honor several weeks ago; and I	15	Q.	If Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations
16		understand that your Honor has reserved	16		were too high, that would impact your conclusions
17		judgment on those issues. But I just wanted	17		about streamflow at the state line. Right?
18		to flag that my cross-examination may be a	18	Α.	No.
19		little bit unconventional because I have to	19	Q.	Your testimony is that if Dr. Flewelling's
20		cross Dr. Hornberger on work done by other	20		consumptive use was too high, it would not impact
21		experts. But I'm happy to proceed with that	21		your calculations of streamflow depletions at the
22		pending the Court's ruling.	22		Chattahoochee Gage?
23		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.	23	Α.	Streamflow depletions that are calculated
24	BY I	MS. ALLON:	24		using the PRMS model did not depend upon
25	Q.	Now, Dr. Hornberger, in your testimony you offer	25		Dr. Flewelling's estimates of consumptive use.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockbart
		2014			2016
1		2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use.	1	Q.	I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking
1 2		2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right?	1 2	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about
1 2 3	Α.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes.	1 2 3	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert,	1 2 3 4	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as	1 2 3 4 5	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the underlying data and manipulate it in any way; did	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct. And then Dr. Flewelling evaluated Dr. Sunding's adjustment and found that the new invication
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the underlying data and manipulate it in any way; did you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct. And then Dr. Flewelling evaluated Dr. Sunding's adjustment and found that the new irrigation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the underlying data and manipulate it in any way; did you? I did not manipulate underlying data.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct. And then Dr. Flewelling evaluated Dr. Sunding's adjustment and found that the new irrigation depths reduced Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the underlying data and manipulate it in any way; did you? I did not manipulate underlying data. You now offer the opinion that Dr. Flewelling's estimates of Georgia's consumptive use are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Q. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct. And then Dr. Flewelling evaluated Dr. Sunding's adjustment and found that the new irrigation depths reduced Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use estimates agricultural consumptive use
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the underlying data and manipulate it in any way; did you? I did not manipulate underlying data. You now offer the opinion that Dr. Flewelling's estimates of Georgia's consumptive use are conservative Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct. And then Dr. Flewelling evaluated Dr. Sunding's adjustment and found that the new irrigation depths reduced Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use estimates by 6 to 7 percent. Isn't that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2014 opinions quantifying Georgia's consumptive use. Right? Yes. And you're relying on another Florida expert, Dr. Flewelling you're relying on his work as the basis for those opinions. Right? Yes. You didn't repeat any of Dr. Flewelling's calculations for the conclusions he reached to independently see if you could verify them; did you? I reviewed all of the work and but I you're right; I did not do independent calculations. I certainly reviewed it and checked it and accepted it. You didn't repeat any of his calculations to see independently if you got the same number. Right? Not in bulk, that's correct. You didn't make any effort to go back to the underlying data and manipulate it in any way; did you? I did not manipulate underlying data. You now offer the opinion that Dr. Flewelling's estimates of Georgia's consumptive use are conservative. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2016 I'm not asking about the PRMS model. I'm asking about the modeling you did that we talked about at the beginning of this cross-examination where you looked at increases and decreases to Georgia's consumptive use, and you assessed what impact those increases or decreases would have on state line flows. Is it your testimony that if Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use calculations were too high, that would have no impact on those conclusions? No. Obviously when where we used it for those scenarios, the the results would scale. Now, one part of consumptive use estimates is irrigation depths. Right? Yes. Dr. Sunding actually updated his irrigation depths after expert reports were submitted. Right? I believe that is correct. And then Dr. Flewelling evaluated Dr. Sunding's adjustment and found that the new irrigation depths reduced Dr. Flewelling's consumptive use estimates by 6 to 7 percent. Isn't that right? Yes. THE REPORTING CEDUE

		2017			2019
1	Q.	And your testimony is that this impact is	1		from small impoundments results in streamflow
2		insignificant. Right?	2		depletions. Right?
3	Α.	It doesn't make any material difference to my	3	Α.	Yes.
4		conclusions. That's right.	4	Q.	And, therefore, you include that in your
5	Q.	Now, I want to turn to slide 28, please.	5		calculation of consumptive use estimates?
6		And slide 28 is taken directly from	6	Δ.	Yes.
7		Dr. Elewelling's spreadsheet underlying his	7	0	And this is based on work originally done by
, 8		consumptive use estimates. Dr. Elewelling	8	ч.	Dr. Elewelling Pight2
0		consumptive use estimates. Dr. newening	0	^	Voc
9		calculated peak summer consumptive use in some	9	A.	
10		years to be over 3,000 crs. Right?	10	Q.	You didn't do any independent analysis to
11	A.	Yes.	11		evaluate evaporative water loss from small farm
12	Q.	For example, in May of 2007 and that's what we	12		impoundments; did you?
13		highlighted in yellow Dr. Flewelling estimated	13	Α.	By repeating Dr. Flewelling's calculations
14		agricultural consumptive use to be 3,867 cfs.	14	Q.	Yes.
15		Right?	15	Α.	is that what you mean?
16	Α.	Yes.	16		No. I reviewed them and did what we call
17	Q.	Now, you can take my word for it or I can give	17		spot checks. But, no, I did not get into the
18		you a calculator; but 6 to 7 percent of 3,867 cfs	18		underlying data base and do massive amounts of
19		is about 232 to 270 cfs. Does that sound right?	19		computation.
20	Α.	Sounds about right.	20	Q.	Now, Dr. Flewelling estimated incremental
21	Q.	That difference, 232 to 270 cfs, that's what you	21		evaporation from small impoundments based on the
22		were referring to when you testified that the	22		surface area of the small impoundment. Right?
23		difference was insignificant. Is that correct?	23	Α.	Yes.
24	Α.	It is immaterial with respect to my opinions.	24	Q.	And the way he estimated the surface area is he
25	0	That wasn't my question My question was when	25		looked at aerial imagery data for certain years
25	ω,		20		
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockbart
		2018	Ι.		2020
1		you referred to a difference, you were referring	1		2020 Right?
1 2		you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to	1 2	Α.	2020 Right? Yes.
1 2 3		you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the	1 2 3	A. Q.	2020 Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface
1 2 3 4		2018 you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant?	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2020 Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	А.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6	А.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is.	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of
1 2 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. А. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Picht?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right?Yes.He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right?Yes.Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right?Yes.So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right?Yes.Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right?Yes.All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Elewelling estimated the surface area of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a small impoundment is basically a man-made body of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Flewelling estimated the surface area of complexity impoundments is increased for a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	A. Q. A.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a small impoundment is basically a man-made body of water that farmers construct to store water.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Flewelling estimated the surface area of small impoundments using aerial imagery from
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23	A. Q. A.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a small impoundment is basically a man-made body of water that farmers construct to store water. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Flewelling estimated the surface area of small impoundments using aerial imagery from 1993, 2010, and 2014. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24	A. Q. A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a small impoundment is basically a man-made body of water that farmers construct to store water. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 27	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Flewelling estimated the surface area of small impoundments using aerial imagery from 1993, 2010, and 2014. Right? I believe that's right. 12020
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a small impoundment is basically a man-made body of water that farmers construct to store water. Right? Yes. And you assume in your testimony that evaporation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Flewelling estimated the surface area of small impoundments using aerial imagery from 1993, 2010, and 2014. Right? I believe that's right. 1993 and 2010 were both preceded by relatively
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	you referred to a difference, you were referring to that 6 to 7 percent difference, that 232 to 270 cfs difference, for your testimony that the difference was insignificant? Significance is very difficult to assess depending upon what your comparison is. Obviously one could say 200 cfs is significant to someone if they're not getting 200 cfs. But in terms of evaluating impacts, it didn't have a material impact on my analysis. So in that sense, it was insignificant to me. Dr. Hornberger, I'm going to ask you to try to answer my question; and my question was a very narrow question. It was just when you said the difference was insignificant, is the difference you're referring to the one we just walked through of 6 to 7 percent equating to 232 to 270 cfs? For May of 2007, yes, that's the calculation. Let's talk about small impoundments. Now, a small impoundment is basically a man-made body of water that farmers construct to store water. Right? Yes. And you assume in your testimony that evaporation THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Right? Yes. He then used a regression to estimate the surface area for other years. Right? Yes. Now, Dr. Flewelling gets to incremental evaporation by multiplying the surface area of the small impoundment by the ET deficit. Right? Yes. So the greater the estimated cumulative surface area of the small impoundments, the greater the evaporative loss from them. Right? Yes. Now, storage in small impoundments is increased by rainfall; is that right? Yes. All else being equal, a small impoundment will have a greater surface area after a period of a lot of rain than a period with no rain. Right? Yes. Dr. Flewelling estimated the surface area of small impoundments using aerial imagery from 1993, 2010, and 2014. Right? I believe that's right. 1993 and 2010 were both preceded by relatively THE REPORTING GROUP

		2021			2023
1		wet years. Correct?	1		take out, the streamflow is depleted by 1 cfs.
2	Α.	I believe that's right.	2		Right?
3	Q.	Okay. So for at least two of the three years	3	Α.	For irrigation, yes.
4		that Dr. Flewelling directly estimated small	4	Q.	Okay. But when you talk about groundwater
5		impoundment surface area, he did so after	5		pumping, you don't have the same one-to-one
6		relatively wet years. Right?	6		impact on streamflow. Right?
7	Α.	Yes.	7	Α.	That is correct.
8	Q.	Dr. Flewelling could have used years after	8	Q.	For every 1 cfs of water you pump from
9		drought years instead of years after wet years.	9		groundwater, you're not going to see a reduction
10		Right?	10		in surface water flows of that same 1 cfs.
11	Α.	I'm not sure what of the aerial photography was	11		Right?
12		available. If assuming that the aerial	12	Α.	Not in many cases, that's correct.
13		photography was available for other years, then	13	Q.	Now, you used the term impact factor in your
14		that could have been done. But I don't know that	14		direct testimony. Right?
15		those data are available.	15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	Since we don't have Dr. Flewelling with us in	16	Q.	And an impact factor is a way to take groundwater
17		the courtroom, why don't we take a look at	17		pumping data and convert it to streamflow
18		Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this topic. You	18		depletions. Right?
19		have a binder that's called volume 2 in front of	19	Α.	Yes.
20		you, and that has in it Dr. Flewelling's	20	Q.	And you also sometimes refer to it as a
21		deposition testimony. And if you turn to page	21		groundwater conversion factor. Right?
22		248 of that testimony, I'm going to ask you to	22	Α.	Yes.
23		look at line 20.	23	Q.	And in this case in your testimony, you offer
24	Α.	What page again?	24		some opinions about the appropriate groundwater
25	Q.	248.	25		impact factors. Right?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2022			2024
1	Α.	2022 Yes, I see that.	1	Α.	2024 Yes.
1 2	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was	1 2	A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about
1 2 3	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after	1 2 3	A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years.	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right?	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not.
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А. Q. Д.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through aroundwater pumping. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your event work, you have never before
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your expert work, you have never before run or used the Jones and Torak groundwater
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right? Yes. Now, when you irrigate from surface water, there's a one-to-one impact on streamflow	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your expert work, you have never before run or used the Jones and Torak groundwater model: have you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right? Yes. Now, when you irrigate from surface water, there's a one-to-one impact on streamflow. Binht?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your expert work, you have never before run or used the Jones and Torak groundwater model; have you?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2022 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right? Yes. Now, when you irrigate from surface water, there's a one-to-one impact on streamflow. Right? Yes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your expert work, you have never before run or used the Jones and Torak groundwater model; have you? No.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right? Yes. Meaning for every cfs of surface water that you 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Jones and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your expert work, you have never before run or used the Jones and Torak groundwater model; have you? No. Now Dr. Langseth, he doesn't know how to run the lones and Torak model either: does he?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 Yes, I see that. And do you see at line 20 Dr. Flewelling was asked, you could have compared years after drought years instead of years after wet years. Right? And his answer was, that's correct. Do you see that? I do. You don't have any basis to disagree with Dr. Flewelling's testimony on this point; do you? I do not. Now, I want to talk about your groundwater opinions. And I understand that some of these opinions were adopted from another Florida expert, Dr. Langseth. Is that correct? That's correct. Now, much of Georgia's agricultural irrigation is done through groundwater pumping. Is that right? Yes. Now, when you irrigate from surface water, there's a one-to-one impact on streamflow. Right? Yes. Meaning for every cfs of surface water that you THE REPORTING GROUP 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2024 Yes. Now, even though you're offering opinions about impact factors, you never independently ran a groundwater model for this case; did you? I did not. You never ran any codes to calculate groundwater/surface water interaction; did you? I did not. Now, Jones and Torak is a groundwater model of the ACF Basin that was developed by USGS. Isn't that right? Yes. You have never used the Jones and Torak groundwater model for any impact work. Have you? We rely on the reported results from the Joness and Torak model. But if your question is did I run a computer, then the answer is no. I did not do computation. Okay. Not just in this case. My question was in any of your expert work, you have never before run or used the Jones and Torak groundwater model; have you? No. Now Dr. Langseth, he doesn't know how to run the Jones and Torak model either; does he? THE REPORTING GROUP

		2025			2027
1	Α.	That's not true.	1	Α.	Dr. Langseth was part of a hydrology team. And,
2		MR. SINGARELLA: Objection.	2		again, we had many conversations. I reviewed the
3	Α.	That is not true. That is simply not true. I	3		work. He reviewed the work of others. I
4		know how to run the Jones and Torak model. I	4		certainly rely on Dr. Langseth's work and adopt
5		have run groundwater models. I have written a	5		it, if that's your question.
6		book on groundwater modeling. And it's	6	Q.	Why don't we turn to your deposition transcript
7		absolutely outrageous to suggest that either I or	7		at page 238.
8		Dr. Langseth doesn't know how to run the Jones	8		MS. ALLON: And I'm going to ask Mr. Smith to
9		and Torak model.	9		play clip 72.
10	Q.	Why don't we take a look at Dr. Langseth's	10		(Whereupon the video was played.)
11		deposition testimony on this topic. On page 7 of	11	BY	MS. ALLON:
12		his transcript at line 15 Lasked Dr. Langseth.	12	Q.	Were you asked those questions, and did you give
13		is it fair to say that you personally don't have	13		those answers?
14		the capacity to run it; but there are others on	14	Δ.	Yes.
15		your team who do?	15	0	Now you used the term short-term impact factor
16		And he answered well as I sit here right	16		to mean the average percent of water that results
17		now. I don't know the specific command structure	17		in streamflow depletion over one year _ Pight?
18		for running that model	18	Δ	Ves
10		Do you see that?	10	0	And you say that you rely on 60 percent as a
20	Δ		20	ч.	conservative estimate of the actual short-term
20	<u> </u>	Now for his groundwater analysis in connection	20		impact factor
21	ц.	with this case. Dr. Langeoth pover did rup a	21	^	
22		with this case, Dr. Langseth never did run a	22	A.	res.
23	^	The lieve that's correct	23	ω.	And in support of the 60 percent impact factor,
24	A.	I believe that s correct.	24	•	
25	ц.		25	А.	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2026			2028
1		2026	1	0	2028
1		2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in	1	Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert
1 2 3	۸	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right?	1	Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Bight?
1 2 3	А.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct	1 2 3	Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right?
1 2 3 4 5	A.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct.	1 2 3 4	Q. A.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes.
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Bioht2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And L want to refer to his expert report so that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yee	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. Q. А.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А. Q. А. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in yolume 2 of the binders that you have in front of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there. Dr. Hornberger2
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues. do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that question.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the relationship between pumping and streamflow depletions?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that question.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the relationship between pumping and streamflow depletions? Yae
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that question. The reason you said you didn't need to do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the relationship between pumping and streamflow depletions? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that question. The reason you said you didn't need to do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because, in your words, Dr. Langseth	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the relationship between pumping and streamflow depletions? Yes. And the question Dr. Langseth says he wanted to answer on page 36 is if numping rates are changed
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that question. The reason you said you didn't need to do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because, in your words, Dr. Langseth's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the relationship between pumping and streamflow depletions? Yes. And the question Dr. Langseth says he wanted to answer on page 36 is if pumping rates are changed
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2026 model in support of his affirmative opinions in this case. Is that right? He didn't run the numerical groundwater models; that's correct. Instead of actually running the models, Dr. Langseth extrapolated numbers from published results to come up with groundwater impact factors. Right? Yes. And you used the groundwater impact factors calculated by Dr. Langseth? Yes. You relied on Dr. Langseth for the impact factors? There wasn't enough inflection in it. Yes. And the reason you didn't do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because Dr. Langseth did it. Is that right? Could you repeat that again? I didn't get that question. The reason you said you didn't need to do anything to independently verify Dr. Langseth's work was because, in your words, Dr. Langseth did it? THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2028 And you also rely on a report that was written by Sorab Panday, who is Georgia's groundwater expert in this case. Right? Amongst others, yes. And that report was written in 1998. Right? Yes. Now, let's start with Dr. Langseth's analysis. And I want to refer to his expert report so that we can see his discussion of impact factors first-hand. So Dr. Langseth's report is in volume 2 of the binders that you have in front of you, and I want to turn to page 36. Are you there, Dr. Hornberger? Yes. Okay. Now, if you look at the paragraph that starts among the issues, do you see that? Yes. Now, I'm not going to read verbatim from the report, but do you see that Dr. Langseth performed a quantitative evaluation of the relationship between pumping and streamflow depletions? Yes. And the question Dr. Langseth says he wanted to answer on page 36 is if pumping rates are changed THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart

		2029			2031
1		by a given amount in a given location, how much	1		mentioned 60 percent as an impact factor. Did
2		will streamflow change in the near term. Right?	2		he?
3	Α.	Yes.	3	Α.	I believe somewhere in his report I'm certain
4	Q.	And Dr. Langseth said that mathematical	4		that he articulated why the .41 was very
5		simulation models are the state-of-the-art tools	5		conservative.
6		used to answer this question. Right?	6	Q.	That wasn't my question. My question was in his
7	Α.	Yes.	7		expert report, Dr. Langseth never mentioned 60
8	Q.	He said that there have been numerous groundwater	8		percent as an impact factor. Did he?
9		models for aquifers that have been developed for	9	Α.	I'm not sure. But I you know, I would have to
10		the ACF Basin, Right?	10		go back and he was certainly focused on the
11	Α.	Yes.	11		.41 from the Jones and Torak. I don't know if he
12	Q.	And Dr. Langseth himself actually reviewed those	12		mentioned specifically 60 percent or not.
13		models. Right?	13	Q.	Are you aware that on June 16, 2016, on the first
14	Α.	Yes.	14		day of Dr. Langseth's four days of deposition in
15	Q.	And Dr. Langseth explained that the lones and	15		this matter, he explained that 40.6 percent is
16		Torak model was developed for and adopted by	16		the annual impact factor for pumping in the ACF
17		Georgia to estimate streamflow depletions related	17		nortion in Georgia's nortion of the ACE Basin?
18		to pumping during drought years Right?	18	Δ	I don't know that for a fact, but I will take
19	Δ	Ves	19	7	your word for it
20	Q.	Based on Dr. Langseth's review of	20	Q.	You're aware that Dr. Langseth drafted a
21		previously-developed models. Dr. Langseth	21		supplemental memo on June 28, 2016, Right?
22		selected the model developed by Jones and Torak	22	Δ.	Yes.
23		Is that correct?	23	0	Okay The memo is actually addressed to you?
24	Δ.	Yes.	24	ч.	Right?
25	0	Dr. Langseth said that the Jones and Torak model	25	Δ	Ves
	·	THE REPORTING GROUP		7	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2030			2032
1		2030	1	Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60
1		2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow.	1	Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it?
1 2 3		2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right?	1 2 3	Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it?
1 2 3 4	Α.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4	Q. A.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not.
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. Q. A.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor that was different than his original impact
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right? Yes. And you used 60 percent as your impact factor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor that was different than his original impact factor. Am I right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right? Yes. And you used 60 percent as your impact factor. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor that was different than his original impact factor. Am I right? I'll take your word for it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right? Yes. And you used 60 percent as your impact factor. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor that was different than his original impact factor. Am I right? I'll take your word for it. Are you aware that on his fourth day of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right? Yes. And you used 60 percent as your impact factor. Right? Yes. But in his expert report, Dr. Langseth never	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor that was different than his original impact factor. Am I right? I'll take your word for it. Are you aware that on his fourth day of deposition Dr. Langseth testified that he had
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2030 is the best currently-available model simulation to address the impact of pumping on streamflow. Is that right? Yes. Now, Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to calculate an impact factor of 41 percent. Is that right? Yes. Dr. Langseth relied on the Jones and Torak model to determine that pumping of 100 cfs from groundwater reduces surface water streamflow that year by 41 cfs. Is that right? 100 to 41, is that what you said? Yes. Yes. Yes. Now, in your direct testimony, you say, I agree with Dr. Langseth that the short-term impact factor ranges from at least 41 percent to a more realistic, yet still conservative, 60 percent. Right? Yes. And you used 60 percent as your impact factor. Right? Yes. But in his expert report, Dr. Langseth never THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2032 And that memo didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. Did it? I would have to go back and reread it, but I don't recall if it specifically did or not. Are you aware that in July, the night before his next round of deposition, Dr. Langseth disclosed some additional notes and analysis? I don't think I know that. And you have never seen those? I I can't say for sure. I don't recall them. Would it surprise you to learn that those notes didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor? No. Now, we already talked about Dr. Langseth's testimony from his first day of deposition. On the second and third day, Dr. Langseth didn't mention anything about a 60 percent impact factor. But on the fourth day, Dr. Langseth did testify for the first time about an impact factor that was different than his original impact factor. Am I right? I'll take your word for it. Are you aware that on his fourth day of deposition Dr. Langseth testified that he had THE REPORTING GROUP

		2033			2035
1		changed his impact factor from 40.6 percent to	1	Q.	You don't disagree that more up-to-date
2		40.8 percent?	2		information has become available in the past 20
3	Α.	I didn't recall that.	3		years; do you?
4	Q.	Okay. And are you aware that I asked	4	Α.	No.
5		Dr. Langseth, are you changing the opinion in	5	Q.	And you're aware that actually USGS has released
6		your first report as to the proper impact factor?	6		a new model since 1996 since 1998. Right?
7		And he said he was not. Are you aware of that?	7	Α.	Yes.
8	Α.	I wasn't aware of it.	8	Q.	And that new model is called the Jones and Torak
9	0	Now the second thing you rely on in support of	9	-	model Right?
10	~ .	your 60 percent impact factor is a 1999 '98	10	Δ	Vec
11		bydrogeologic paper that reports modeling results	11	<u> </u>	And you know that the undated lones and Torak
12		hydrogeologic paper that reports modeling results	12	α.	model is based on more accurate data. Pight?
12		Dight2	12	^	Containly more up to date data
13	•		13	A.	And USCS energifically described the lance and
14	А.	Yes. That's that's one of the references that	14	Q.	And USGS specifically described the Jones and
15	~	we	15		Torak model as an improvement from the Torak and
16	Q.	Now, Dr. Panday ran the groundwater model that	16		McDowell model. Right?
17		generated the results that you cite to 20 years	17	A.	Yes.
18		ago. Right?	18	Q.	Now, we talked before about Dr. Langseth's expert
19	Α.	Yes.	19		report, and we said that Dr. Langseth had done a
20	Q.	The modeling that Dr. Panday did in the report	20		survey of other groundwater models. Right?
21		that you cite to was based on a 1996 Torak and	21	Α.	Yes.
22		McDowell model. Right?	22	Q.	And he had concluded that the Jones and Torak
23	Α.	Yes.	23		model is the best currently-available model to
24	Q.	The Torak and McDowell model was created by USGS.	24		evaluate the relationship between pumping and
25		Right?	25		streamflow changes in the ACF Basin. Right?
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2034			2036
1	Α.	2034 Yes.	1	Α.	2036 Yes.
1 2	A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model;	1 2	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's
1 2 3	A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you?	1 2 3	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders.
1 2 3 4	A. Q. A.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No.	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he?	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2034 Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al.,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al., 1996 models.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you? I have looked at it. So you know that he said that your reliance on an	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	2036 Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al., 1996 models. Do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you? I have looked at it. So you know that he said that your reliance on an older model is unreasonable because there's more	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q.	Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. Mat then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al., 1996 models. Do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you? I have looked at it. So you know that he said that your reliance on an older model is unreasonable because there's more up-to-date information available. Are you aware	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al., 1996 models. Do you see that? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you? I have looked at it. So you know that he said that your reliance on an older model is unreasonable because there's more up-to-date information available. Are you aware that he said that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. Mnd then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al., 1996 models. Do you see that? Yes. The model Dr. Langseth refers to in his report as being superseded is the same model you cite in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? To my knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you? I have looked at it. So you know that he said that your reliance on an older model is unreasonable because there's more up-to-date information available. Are you aware that he said that? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Jones and torak, 2006. Do you see that? Yes. The model Dr. Langseth refers to in his report as being superseded is the same model you cite in paragraph 100 of your testimony as supporting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	Yes. You have never run the Torak and McDowell model; have you? No. And Dr. Langseth has never run the Torak and McDowell model; has he? Not that I know of. So the only person that has actually run the Torak and McDowell model is Georgia's groundwater expert, Dr. Panday? I assume that Torak and McDowell ran it. The only person who is directly and personally involved in this litigation who has run the Torak and McDowell model to your knowledge is Dr. Panday? Tony knowledge. Now, I'm sure you have reviewed the direct testimony submitted in this case by Dr. Panday. Have you? I have looked at it. So you know that he said that your reliance on an older model is unreasonable because there's more up-to-date information available. Are you aware that he said that? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	Yes. Okay. Now, I want to turn to Dr. Langseth's expert report. It's in volume 2 of your binders. And I want to turn to page 37. And I just want to read five lines of Dr. Langseth's discussion where he has reviewed other models. It's the second full paragraph under section 4.1.1. And Dr. Langseth says, I also screened out models that had been clearly superceded by newer models constructed either by the same model developers, or by others. This consideration screened out the following models developed by Torak and McDowell 1996, and Torak, et al., 1996, that were superceded by the model developed by Jones and Torak, 2006. And then Dr. Langseth goes on to say, I also screened out use of the model developed by Hydrogeologic, Inc., 1998, since it was based on the Torak and McDowell 2006, and Torak, et al., 1996 models. Do you see that? Yes. The model Dr. Langseth refers to in his report as being superseded is the same model you cite in paragraph 100 of your testimony as supporting

		2037			2039
1		your use of the 60 percent impact factor. Is	1	Α.	I mean, that's what storage reservoirs do; and
2		that right?	2		that's how the Army Corps operates, to store in
3	Α.	Yes.	3		wet times and release in low times. One would
4	Q.	Dr. Langseth specifically considered the	4		have to do a very careful analysis as to what the
5		Hydrogeologic model and screened it out of	5		hydrologic feasibility would be. I haven't done
6		consideration because it was superseded by the	6		that.
7		Jones and Torak model. Is that correct?	7	Q.	But you agree with me that the Corps could decide
8	Α.	Yes.	8		to change its operations to allow for more
9	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, you offer some opinions on the	9		releases and a higher minimum flow at the state
10		feasibility of reducing Georgia's water use. Is	10		line, and that could work in terms of getting
11		that right?	11		more water to Florida. Isn't that right?
12	Α.	Yes.	12	Α.	The Army Corps can't manufacture water. So the
13	Q.	But you're not offering an opinion that Georgia's	13		reason I'm hesitating is that if the water isn't
14	_ .	water use needs to be reduced or constrained in	14		there in the reservoirs, the Army can't release
15		any way: are you?	15		it. And so one would have to do a very, very
16	Δ	I'm I don't think I fully understand the	16		careful analysis to determine
17	Λ.	question Needs to be in what sense?	17		In the long run. I don't think that it is
18	0	Is it one of your opinions in this report that	18		feasible for the Army to augment flows. But it
19	ч.	Georgia's consumptive use needs to be	10		might be possible for restricted periods. Liust
20		constrained?	20		don't know. I would have to do a very careful
20	۸	My opinion I guess is a hydrologic opinion	20		analysis
21	Α.	And if flows to Florida are to be increased, then	21	0	All right Let's take a look at your deposition
22		Georgia's concumptive use must be surtailed. But	22	α.	transcript at page 171
23		that's a hydrologic opinion	23		MS ALLON: And I would like to ask
24	0	Dight But you're not offering a policy	24		Mrs. Allon. And I would like to ask
25	ω.		25		
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2038			2040
1		2038 opinion	1		(Whereupon the video was played)
1	Α.	2038 opinion L am not	1	BY	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS_ALLON:
1 2 3	A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its	1 2 3	ВҮ Q .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that guestion: and
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place?	1 2 3 4	вү Q .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not.	1 2 3 4 5	ΒΥ Q.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work.
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's	1 2 3 4 5 6	вү Q . А .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	вү Q . А .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	вү Q. А.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ВҮ Q. А.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	вү Q. А.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	вү Q. А.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	вү Q. A.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	вү Q. A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	вү Q. A.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	вү Q. A.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ВҮ Q. A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its operations to allow for more releases from any of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Go ahead.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its operations to allow for more releases from any of the upstream reservoirs and to allow for a higher	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	вү Q. A.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Go ahead. We'll break at noontime.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its operations to allow for more releases from any of the upstream reservoirs and to allow for a higher minimum flow at the state line, and that could	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	вү Q. A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Go ahead. We'll break at noontime. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its operations to allow for more releases from any of the upstream reservoirs and to allow for a higher minimum flow at the state line, and that could work in terms of getting more water to Florida.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Go ahead. We'll break at noontime. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. We'll see you after lunch.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its operations to allow for more releases from any of the upstream reservoirs and to allow for a higher minimum flow at the state line, and that could work in terms of getting more water to Florida. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	вү Q . A .	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Go ahead. We'll break at noontime. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. We'll see you after lunch. THE CLERK: He said go ahead.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2038 opinion I am not. as to whether Georgia needs to constrain its flows in the first place? I am not. You are offering the opinion that if Georgia's consumptive use is cut, that would provide significant benefit to Florida. Right? Yes. And what you mean is that the additional water Georgia conserves will make its way to the Apalachicola River as additional flow. Right? Yes. There are other ways to provide additional flow entering the Apalachicola River that do not necessarily involve reducing Georgia's water use. Isn't that right? Weather modification, cloud seeding, nothing practical. The Army Corps could decide to change its operations to allow for more releases from any of the upstream reservoirs and to allow for a higher minimum flow at the state line, and that could work in terms of getting more water to Florida. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	вү Q. A.	2040 (Whereupon the video was played.) MS. ALLON: Dr. Hornberger, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer? I did. It might work. MS. ALLON: I have nothing else, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: Good morning, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning. MR. SINGARELLA: I think it's still morning. It's getting close to the noon hour. I'm happy to start, of course; but if you would like to break at this point SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please go ahead. MR. SINGARELLA: we would be happy to take our break, too. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Go ahead. We'll break at noontime. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. We'll see you after lunch. THE CLERK: He said go ahead. THE REPORTING GROUP

		2041			2043
1		MR. SINGARELLA: Oh, go ahead. Thank	1		Basin. So it was a large component.
2		you.	2	Q.	And upon what basic data do hydrologists rely?
3		Sorry. I misunderstood that.	3	Α.	Well, amongst them, as I started to say right
4		REDIRECT EXAMINATION	4		before lunch, was a discharge that is reported
5	BY	MR. SINGARELLA:	5		by chiefly by the U.S. Geological Survey for a
6	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, how would you describe your	6		whole suite of what we refer to as gaging
7		scientific discipline?	7		stations, in other words, points on a river where
8	Α.	I'm a hydrologist. Hydrology is water science.	8		these measurements are made.
9		I study how the natural system works in terms of	9	Q.	And what do you mean by the word discharge in
10		rainfall and runoff in river basins basically.	10		this context?
11	Q.	And how would your discipline of hydrology help	11	Α.	So discharge is a measurement of the volume of
12		us understand the issues related to Georgia's	12		water flowing in a river or stream past the gage,
13		water consumption?	13		past the point on the river. So and it's
14	Α.	So the of course, the one of the main	14		typically expressed in this country as cubic feet
15		things that we look at is recorded streamflow.	15		per second. So it's that many cubic feet flowing
16		Streamflow records really tell you the data	16		past that point every second.
17		tells you how much water is flowing from the	17	Q.	And you mentioned the USGS. What is the USGS?
18		upper reaches of a basin, high areas. Water	18	Α.	The United States Geological Survey is basically
19		flows downhill, collects itself into rivers, and	19		the in the Department of Interior of the
20		flows out of the basin. So we definitely look at	20		United States. They are in charge of the stream
21		streamflow records as one major thing.	21		gaging program and the network in the country.
22		MR. SINGARELLA: And, your Honor, we're	22	Q.	And you mentioned a gaging station. What is a
23		going to actually use some of the boards that	23		gaging station?
24		we prepared that show some of the streamflow	24	Α.	So a gaging station we've been talking about,
25		records. So at some point we will have to	25		for example here, at the Chattahoochee Gage. The
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2042			2044
1		just take a pause to set up those boards as	1		Chattahoochee Gage is on the Apalachicola River
2		well.	2		at the near the right at the state line
3		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Then why	3		where the river flows into Florida. So there's a
4		don't we take our noon break now.	4		gage there.
5		MR. SINGARELLA: Okay. Thank you, your	5		Now, what is a gage? You may have been
6		Honor.	6		driving along, and particularly if you pass a
7		(Time Noted: 11:46 a.m.)	7		bridge, you may see a vertical pipe with a little
8		(Recess Called)	8		roof on it. And that is what it's called a
9		(Time Noted: 12:50 p.m.)	9		stage recorder. And in pre-electronic days, what
10		MR. SINGARELLA: Good afternoon, your	10		that consisted of was a float that went up and
11		Honor.	11		down as the river level went up and down. And it
12		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good	12		went around a spindle, and a pin recorded it.
13		afternoon.	13		It's basically the same thing now except
14		MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you for giving us	14		that, of course, we do it electronically.
15		the opportunity to break a little bit earlier	15		And there are other gages that I relied on.
16		before lunch so that Dr. Hornberger could be	16		Bainbridge is up here. It's on the Flint Basin,
17		surrounded by his boards and his data.	17		and it's right before the Flint flows into Lake
18	BY	MR. SINGARELLA:	18		Seminole. And I think we talked this morning
19	Q.	Doctor, on cross many of the questions you heard	19		about the Iron City Gage, which is a gage on
20		rrom Ms. Allon were about computer modeling. To	20		Spring Creek. So those gages, amongst others, I
21		what extent was there a data analysis related to	21		
22		your computer modeling?	22		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Excuse me,
23	Α.	I TRINK THE a very large part of my work was	23		
24		to investigate the basic data that described the	24		MR. SINGAKELLA: YES, SIT?
25			25		
		I TE KERUKTING GRUUP			I DE KEFUK HING GKUUP
			1		IVIASULI & LUCKITAL

I

	2045			2047
1	to see where his light is flashing on?	1		outlined in green here. It's about 62 percent of
2	MS. ALLON: No, your Honor.	2		the area that drains to the Apalachicola River.
3	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Would you	3		And it is the area of very intense agriculture
4	like to come around and sit somewhere where	4		irrigated agriculture.
5	you can?	5	Q.	Now, which one is the Chattahoochee board?
6	I'm just	6	Α.	It's the map?
7	MS. ALLON: I don't know if Florida	7	Q.	I was wondering about the flow records.
8	perhaps has copies for us. Perhaps that	8	Α.	Oh, the flow records. The flow records here
9	would work, too.	9		are this is the Apalachicola River at
10	MR. SINGARELLA: We don't have copies	10		Chattahoochee, Florida. That's the tall one,
11	other copies of the boards. These records	11		long record.
12	here are all from one of the joint documents.	12	Q.	So how does one obtain the records shown on
13	MS. ALLON: I'll just walk around.	13		we'll call that the big board, the Chattahoochee
14	Thank you, your Honor.	14		board.
15	MR. PERRY: The Bainbridge Gage is	15	Α.	The big board.
16	Exhibit 259 in the book, I believe; and the	16		So measurements of river stage, the float
17	Apalachicola Gage was from the opening	17		that I mentioned, will only give you the
18	statement. I believe you all took a	18		elevation. And so what one has to do is go out
19	photograph of it. It's also in the exhibits.	19		periodically with a velocity meter and actually
20	MR. SINGARELLA: Can we proceed,	20		measure how much water is flowing. This gets
21	Ms. Allon? Are you in a good position there?	21		related to the level of water in the river. We
22	MS. ALLON: I'm good. Thank you.	22		call this a rating curve. And then the stage
23	MR. SINGARELLA: Okay, great. Great.	23		record, the water level records, get converted
24	As Mr. Perry mentioned, these boards	24		into discharge, cubic feet per second. These are
25	last appeared during his opening statement	25		averaged typically to daily values and reported
	THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
	Mason & Lockhart 2046			Mason & Lockhart 2048
1	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding.	1		Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times.
1 2	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA:	1 2		Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet.
1 2 3	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages.	1 2 3		Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with
1 2 3 4	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular	1 2 3 4		Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data.
1 2 3 4 5	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case?	1 2 3 4 5	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the
1 2 3 4 5 6	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida. 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida. Q. So the Chattahoochee Gage is actually in Florida; 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida. Q. So the Chattahoochee Gage is actually in Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida. Q. So the Chattahoochee Gage is actually in Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. A. It's below Jim Woodruff Dam. Q. How about the Bainbridge Gage? 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard to see. I understand that, and I apologize for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. A. It's below Jim Woodruff Dam. Q. How about the Bainbridge Gage? You mentioned the Bainbridge Gage. Is that 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard to see. I understand that, and I apologize for that. But you first pointed to a couple years
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. A. It's below Jim Woodruff Dam. Q. How about the Bainbridge Gage? You mentioned the Bainbridge Gage. Is that of any particular importance in this case? 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard to see. I understand that, and I apologize for that. But you first pointed to a couple years four months out of two years.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida. Q. So the Chattahoochee Gage is actually in Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. A. It's below Jim Woodruff Dam. Q. How about the Bainbridge Gage? You mentioned the Bainbridge Gage. Is that of any particular importance in this case? A. Yes. It's the most downstream gage in the Flint 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard to see. I understand that, and I apologize for that. But you first pointed to a couple years four months out of two years. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida. Q. So the Chattahoochee Gage is actually in Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's below Jim Woodruff Dam. Q. How about the Bainbridge Gage? You mentioned the Bainbridge Gage. Is that of any particular importance in this case? A. Yes. It's the most downstream gage in the Flint River. And what you see is the Flint River Basin 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard to see. I understand that, and I apologize for that. But you first pointed to a couple years four months out of two years. Yes. What what to what years and months do those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 3 4 21 22 23 24 25	 Mason & Lockhart 2046 earlier in the proceeding. BY MR. SINGARELLA: Q. And Doctor, you mentioned some particular gages. Why is the Chattahoochee Gage of a particular importance in this case? A. So the whole notion of a river basin is that it collects rivers collect all the flow above a certain point on the river. That's why we outline the basin that way. So that the rainfall that flows in and starts at the upper end of the basin there are even some mountains in the northern end of the basin flows down through the Flint River, the Chattahoochee River. And they join at Chattahoochee, Florida, to form the Apalachicola River, which flows into Florida; it's not up on the Chattahoochee River? A. It's not on the Chattahoochee River. Q. Thank you. A. It's below Jim Woodruff Dam. Q. How about the Bainbridge Gage? You mentioned the Bainbridge Gage. Is that of any particular importance in this case? A. Yes. It's the most downstream gage in the Flint River. And what you see is the Flint River Basin THE REPORTING GROUP 	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2048 by the USGS monitoring times. Of course, we get them all from the internet. In years past, they used to produce books with these data. And with regard to the yellow highlighting on the big board, why is there yellow highlighting on the big board? So all of these the yellow highlighting indicates months where the average flow was less than 6,000 cfs. And the importance, again, in looking at these records, we see that there are very few there are a few anyway months in which average flow was less than 6,000. And, yet, when we get down here into 19 starting roughly in 1980 and certainly up to 1999 to the present, we see lots of these yellow highlighting indicating there were many, many more months where the average flow for the month was less than 6,000 cfs. And you first pointed to some of this is hard to see. I understand that, and I apologize for that. But you first pointed to a couple years four months out of two years. Yes. What what to what years and months do those THE REPORTING GROUP

		2049			2051
1		particular average monthly flows correspond?	1		look at records before 1971 and records after
2	Α.	So this is 1954 and 1955, and it's October and	2		2001. And, again, we see for example, in
3		November. And 1954 is the year with the	3		2011-2012 we have five months, or seven months.
4		lowest-ever recorded rainfall in the record.	4		And we never had any occurrences except here in
5	Q.	And how might these flow records help one to	5		1954, the lowest precipitation ever; and we did
6		understand the issue of consumption, Georgia's	6		have three occurrences there.
7		consumption of these waters?	7		So, again, it's pretty much the same story
8	Α.	So what happens in a basin like this, you have so	8		that we see a really large impact of consumptive
9		much rainfall coming in. And the rainfall then	9		use.
10		gets apportioned; and some of it flows into the	10	Q.	And what is what is the meaning of the yellow
11		rivers and flows out, in this case, to the	11		highlighting on the small board?
12		Apalachicola River. But some of it is	12	Α.	Oh, thank you. So I had to pick a value for
13		evaporated. So we talk about evaporation, or	13		flows on the Flint at Bainbridge. And I looked
14		transpiration, is just that plants take water	14		at flows less than or equal to 2,500 cfs average
15		from the soil through their roots up through the	15		monthly values.
16		plant; and it gets evaporated from the leaves.	16	Q.	Why did you pick that particular value?
17		We refer to that as transpiration.	17	Α.	So for two reasons. First of all, I recognized
18		Another component is what I refer to as	18		from the data that there were very few months
19		consumptive use, which is the additional return	19		where the flow dropped that low. And also,
20		of water to the atmosphere due to human	20		there's a 1999 report looking at critical low
21		appropriation of water. And so one has to	21		flows to be observed. And the suggested value
22		account for all of these things.	22		was 2,506, I believe.
23		In the absence of any changes in consumptive	23	Q.	So that's there is a threshold some type of
24		use by human appropriation and in the absence of	24		threshold of 2,506?
25		any changes in any systematic changes in	25	Α.	Yes. This was basically to maintain a healthy
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2050			2052
1		2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be	1		2052 ecosystem on the river.
1 2		2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in	1 2	Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is
1 2 3		2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months.	1 2 3	Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called?
1 2 3 4		2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the	1 2 3 4	Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5		2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage?
1 2 3 4 5 6		2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Q. A.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint River Basin. You will notice that this board is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	2052 ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir. Thank you.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 22	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint River Basin. You will notice that this board is not as big because the USGS stopped recording	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. A. Q.	ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir. Thank you. And your Honor, I'm totally remiss for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint River Basin. You will notice that this board is not as big because the USGS stopped recording flows in 1971 and didn't start again until 2001.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir. Thank you. And your Honor, I'm totally remiss for not introducing Devin O'Connor earlier today.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint River Basin. You will notice that this board is not as big because the USGS stopped recording flows in 1971 and didn't start again until 2001. So there's roughly a 30-year gap.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. A.	ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir. Thank you. And your Honor, I'm totally remiss for not introducing Devin O'Connor earlier today. So
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint River Basin. You will notice that this board is not as big because the USGS stopped recording flows in 1971 and didn't start again until 2001. So there's roughly a 30-year gap.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir. Thank you. And your Honor, I'm totally remiss for not introducing Devin O'Connor earlier today. So SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Welcome. THE REDORTING CROUP
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2050 rainfall, we don't anticipate that there would be a change in flows, and particularly low flows in critical summer months. So we look at these data. And basically the data themselves speak to the fact that there has really been a consumptive use impact. And, once again, with regard to the big board for the Chattahoochee flow record, over what time horizon do those records suggest that some kind of hydrologic change has occurred? Well, certainly there's no doubt that starting in 1999 there are just very large differences that we see just by looking at the number of colored months on the board. Now, let's turn our attention to the Bainbridge board for a minute. How would one put together a board like that? We'll call that one the small board. Small board. So, again, we look at records from the Bainbridge Gage, which is here on the Flint River Basin. You will notice that this board is not as big because the USGS stopped recording flows in 1971 and didn't start again until 2001. So there's roughly a 30-year gap. Nevertheless, we can for the Bainbridge Gage ITE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	ecosystem on the river. Could we perhaps turn to the Iron City Gage? Is that what it's called? Yes. What is the Iron City Gage? The Iron City Gage is here on the Spring Creek. And Spring Creek is drains as we heard this morning, drains into Lake Seminole. So it's one of the tributaries to Lake Seminole. And Mr. Berrigan in his opening had a slide showing the gage data from that particular gage. MR. SINGARELLA: Your Honor, may I approach the witness and give him a copy of that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You don't have to stand. MS. ALLON: I can go sit back down? Thank you, your Honor. MR. SINGARELLA: I'll bring one over here, too, sir. Thank you. And your Honor, I'm totally remiss for not introducing Devin O'Connor earlier today. So SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Welcome. THE REPORTING GROUP

		2053			2055
1		MR. SINGARELLA: She is a quite able	1	Α.	Oh, yes. So there are numerous recordings, as I
2		assistant to me, and I really appreciate her	2		think Ms. Allon indicated this morning, of zero.
3		being here today and sitting at the table	3		So the flow recorded flow is zero. It stopped
4		with me.	4		flowing.
5	BY	MR. SINGARELLA:	5	Q.	And what might the flows at Spring Creek, the
6	Q.	Doctor, are you familiar with the data shown in	6		Iron City Gage, tell us about agricultural
7		this figure?	7		irrigation in that part of Georgia?
8	Α.	Yes. This is these are data from Spring Creek	8	Α.	It's it's very clear that the lowering of the
9		near Iron City.	9		groundwater due to pumping is seriously
10	Q.	And what do these streamflow records show?	10		impacting seriously impacting that stream
11	Α.	Again, through the vellow highlighting, we're	11		segment.
12		showing low flows. I can't remember exactly the	12	Q.	I would like to turn your attention. Doctor, to a
13		criterion we used: but all of them, except one of	13		figure we just received a week-and-a-half ago on
14		the numbers here is below 100 cfs. And many are	14		October 26 from Georgia's expert Dr. Bedient
15		much less than that	15		I'm going to put that up on the screen
16	0	And why were you focused on the Spring Creek	16		MR_SINGARELLA: May Lapproach your
17	α.	area?	17		Honor?
10	^	Well the Enring Creek area, even though it's a	10		
10	А.	ample basin we would anticipate that it would	10		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER. EXcuse me,
20		manifact change any impacts first. And in	20		MP SINCAPELLA: Voc cir2
20		mannest change, any impacts first. And in	20		MR. SINGARELLA. Tes, SII ?
21		Spring Creek there is very neavy groundwater	21		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: May I have
22			22		one?
23		really important to look at this to see if to	23		MR. SINGARELLA: Oh, my gosh, I thought
24		see what the signals were telling us up in this	24		the one that I gave I'm so sorry, your
25			25		Honor.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Locknar			Mason & Lockhart
		0054			0050
	~	2054			2056
1	Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon	1		2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
1 2	Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right?	1 2		2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one
1 2 3	Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes.	1 2 3		2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I
1 2 3 4	Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the	1 2 3 4		2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on.
1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events	1 2 3 4 5	BY	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA:
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6	ВҮ Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	ВҮ Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ВҮ Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ВҮ Q .	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	вү Q. А.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	вү Q . А .	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	вү Q . A . Q .	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	вү Q . A . Q .	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	вү Q. А. Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	вү Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BY Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Q. Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	вү Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	вү Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you wanted to walk across. But at 0.18 feet, any one	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ВҮ Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds. And so the top line is the blue line, 6,000.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you wanted to walk across. But at 0.18 feet, any one of us could just step across. It's really	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds. And so the top line is the blue line, 6,000. And one clearly sees that the number of days
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Q. Q. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you wanted to walk across. But at 0.18 feet, any one of us could just step across. It's really reduced to a trickle.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BY Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds. And one clearly sees that the number of days below 6,000 cfs has it has just increased
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you wanted to walk across. But at 0.18 feet, any one of us could just step across. It's really reduced to a trickle. And did you find other occasions where the flows	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	вү Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds. And so the top line is the blue line, 6,000. And one clearly sees that the number of days below 6,000 cfs has it has just increased dramatically.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. And at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you wanted to walk across. But at 0.18 feet, any one of us could just step across. It's really reduced to a trickle. And did you find other occasions where the flows at Spring Creek were below 0.18?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds. And so the top line is the blue line, 6,000. And one clearly sees that the number of days below 6,000 cfs has it has just increased dramatically. And where did Dr. Bedient get his information for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2054 This was one of the gages that Ms. Allon questioned you about. Right? Yes. Yes. Did you have occasion to look at the frequency of low flow events Oh, yes. at Spring Creek? Yes, I did. And so when I looked at the analysis, I my analysis, I looked at low flow days. And prior to 1970, the lowest recorded flow was about 9 was 9 cfs, 9 cubic feet per second. And there were, as I recall, 100 241 days where the flow was less than that after 1970. And if you took 1/50 of that value that's the value for 1/50 of that value, which would be 0.18 cfs, less than 1 cfs. Mnd at 9 cfs, according to the USGS data field data, the stream would be about 20 feet wide. So you would get your boots wet if you wanted to walk across. But at 0.18 feet, any one of us could just step across. It's really reduced to a trickle. And did you find other occasions where the flows at Spring Creek were below 0.18? THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2056 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. MR. SINGARELLA: I seem to be making one faux pas after another today, your Honor. I will carry on. MR. SINGARELLA: So this this particular plot was produced to us on October 26 from Bedient demo 52-53.XLSX. What would that mean, Doctor, that it's it's an XLSX? The XLSX means it's an Excel spreadsheet. So it's a computer spreadsheet. And have you had occasion to look at this chart before your testimony today? Yes. I did see this. And what are your impressions of it? Oh, I think it, again, shows just what we've been talking about, the large increase of even in the '80's and certainly post-1998 in the occurrence, the number of days below these various thresholds. And so the top line is the blue line, 6,000. And one clearly sees that the number of days below 6,000 cfs has it has just increased dramatically. And where did Dr. Bedient get his information for THE REPORTING GROUP

		2057			2059
1		this plot?	1		puddles. We have other things. So this is just
2	Α.	Well, I believe he used the data for the	2		the natural return of water to the atmosphere.
3		Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, the USGS	3		It's also important for my analysis to
4		flow data.	4		look at evapotranspiration because it is one of
5	Q.	And what are these flow records? Are these	5		the major components of what we call the water
6		averages or single days? What are they?	6		balance. The water balance is just keeping track
7	Α.	So these so as I indicated earlier, the USGS	7		of how much water comes in and how much water
8		publishes on their website average daily	8		goes out along various routes. And
9		discharges for their gaging stations. So I think	9		evapotranspiration is an important component.
10		these data are average daily discharges.	10		And it's, therefore, also an important
11	Q.	And to what extent is the pattern that	11		component of consumptive use because we can
12		Dr. Bedient is showing here in his in your	12		create a lot more evapotranspiration by putting
13		similar to patterns that you have yourself	13		water on the land surface, for example, on lawns
14		identified?	14		or agricultural fields.
15	Α.	Yes. It's very similar, very similar.	15	Q.	Did you rely on any particular climate data?
16	Q.	In what respects?	16	Α.	Yes. So we used what is referred to as a gridded
17	Α.	Oh, again, the sort of the number of days, the	17		climate dataset. It was published developed
18		number of low flow days no matter just about	18		by the University of Washington. Dennis
19		no matter what statistic you look at. I have	19		Lettenmaier, who will testify next week, is one
20		looked at a number. And these have just various	20		of the authors of this. It is posted on the
21		thresholds from 5,000 to 6,000. And in just	21		National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
22		about every category you see a dramatic increase	22		website. So it's a well-recognized,
23		in recent years.	23		well-accepted dataset.
24	Q.	And all this information that you have looked at	24		They basically took many, many rainfall
25		so far, do you have an opinion as to its	25		stations, meteorological stations, and basically
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2058			2060
1		2058 reliability?	1		2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's
1	А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these	1 2		2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies.
1 2 3	А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're	1 2 3	Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing,
1 2 3 4	А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish	1 2 3 4	Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to
1 2 3 4 5	A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their	1 2 3 4 5	Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this
1 2 3 4 5 6	А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	А. Q. А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	А. Q. А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	А. Q. А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А. Q. А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А. Q. А.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun - hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these specific drought years that you looked at.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	Peliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun - hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants. And how is evapotranspiration of relevance to this case?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these specific drought years that you looked at. Ms. Allon asked you some questions about this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	2058 reliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants. And how is evapotranspiration of relevance to this case? So, of course, there's evapotranspiration that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these specific drought years that you looked at. Ms. Allon asked you some questions about this this morning. Could you just briefly describe
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	А. Q. А.	Pareirability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun - hours of sunlight, and other climate data for calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants. And how is evapotranspiration of relevance to this case? So, of course, there's evapotranspiration that gue and in any catchment. So it's a natural	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these specific drought years that you looked at. Ms. Allon asked you some questions about this this morning. Could you just briefly describe what this table is?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	А. Q. A.	Peliability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have too keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun shours of sunlight, and other climate data data do a sequent and the reliable data we refer to as fuspiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants. And how is evapotranspiration of relevance to this case? So, of course, there's evapotranspiration that gain of relevance to this case?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these specific drought years that you looked at. Ms. Allon asked you some questions about this this morning. Could you just briefly describe what this table is? Yes. So 1954-1955 represents a multiple-year
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A.	Periability? Yes. I think that the USGS gage data for these gages that we have used are good. They're reliable. USGS takes great pains to publish reliable data and are very careful in their approval process. What other kinds of data do hydrologists rely on? All right. So, of course, as I was saying before, the Apalachicola Basin, what we have to keep track of if we're going to follow the water is how much water is coming in. And so we have to keep track of rainfall. We've already talked about river discharge. We also use climate data such as temperature, sun - hours of sunlight, and other climate data to calculate what we refer to as evapotranspiration. So evapotranspiration is just combining evaporation along with transpiration that I mentioned was really just the evaporation of water through plants. And how is evapotranspiration of relevance to this case? So, of course, there's evapotranspiration that will go on in any catchment. So it's a natural proces. We have a vegetative surface. We have <i>THERPORTING GROUP</i>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2060 used that data to scale it to a grid so that it's most useful for looking at river basin studies. Now, these data that you have been discussing, are these data do they have any relevance to the modeling that was a a major topic this morning? Yes, absolutely. So the the rainfall data provided input to our water budget modeling because if a model is going to keep track of where the water is, where the fall of the water, we have to know how much goes in. And we go through a series of calculations to determine how much is stored in groundwater and how much is flows out of the river and how much is lost by evapotranspiration. Could we turn to your prefiled direct, page 20, please. We'll put it up on the screen. I think everybody has that, table 1. Yes. Let me invite your attention to some of these specific drought years that you looked at. Ms. Allon asked you some questions about this this morning. Could you just briefly describe what this table is? Yes. So 1954-1955 represents a multiple-year THE REPORTING GROUP

		2061			2063
1		drought, two years in a row of lower than normal	1		and rain gages?
2		precipitation. And 2011-2012 are two years	2	Α.	So the rain so rain gages are a point
3		back-to-back years with lower than normal	3		measurement. So perhaps we have all seen rain
4		precipitation.	4		gages. It's a cylinder. It's a bucket.
5		So at the top, you can see I did a comparison	5		The way that NOAA uses it, makes the
6		of the June to September precipitation. So we	6		measurement, it's 8 inches in circumference. It
7		see the June to September precipitation, and we	7		captures the rain and records the rain. So it's
8		see that 1954 is a low year. 1955, somewhat	8		a point measurement.
9		higher, 15.8 inches. And you see that the	9		And the point measurements are great.
10		precipitation is somewhat higher in 2011-2012,	10		That's what we can do. It's about the only thing
11		even though these both represent back-to-back	11		we can do. But, again, we all know from
12		drought years.	12		experience that it can even be raining on one end
13		The temperatures in the summer season for all	13		of Portland and not the other. And so there are
14		of these years are pretty similar. So we	14		some limitations with point measurements.
15		wouldn't anticipate changes in	15		And so to overcome this, we like to use a
16		evapotranspiration. And, yet, when we look at	16		whole series of rain gages and, basically for
17		the June to September streamflow, we see on the	17		studies such as I have done, to interpolate to a
18		order of 3,500 or larger, 4,000 cfs less flow in	18		gridded basis to account for we can never
19		2011-2012.	19		fully account for some of the variability in the
20	Q.	What does that mean to you, sir?	20		rainfall field; but to the extent that we can,
21	Α.	Well, with no other explanation, no explanation	21		that's the best we can do.
22		due to rainfall coming in, that means that there	22	Q.	Earlier today you, in response to one of
23		must have been no change no change in	23		Ms. Allon's questions, referred to two different
24		temperature indicating a change in the	24		kinds of droughts. One I think you said was
25		evapotranspiration, this has to be due to an	25		meteorological; and the other was hydrological.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2062			2064
1		2062 increase in consumptive use.	1		2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those
1 2	Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure	1		2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between
1 2 3	Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison?	1 2 3		2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them?
1 2 3 4	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all	1 2 3 4	А.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or
1 2 3 4 5	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records,	1 2 3 4 5	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And	1 2 3 4 5 6	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of objective rainfall data to a grid to make it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my comparison. There is no reason to think that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of objective rainfall data to a grid to make it useful for watershed studies. And Livneh was the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my comparison. There is no reason to think that there's a more extreme meteorological drought in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of objective rainfall data to a grid to make it useful for watershed studies. And Livneh was the lead author of the of the data product.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my comparison. There is no reason to think that there's a more extreme meteorological drought in 2011-2012. In fact, quite the opposite. But
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of objective rainfall data to a grid to make it useful for watershed studies. And Livneh was the lead author of the of the data product. I have heard you mention grid a few times. What	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my comparison. There is no reason to think that there's a more extreme meteorological drought in 2011-2012. In fact, quite the opposite. But nevertheless, there's a big hydrological
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of objective rainfall data to a grid to make it useful for watershed studies. And Livneh was the lead author of the of the data product. I have heard you mention grid a few times. What is the relationship between gridded climate data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my comparison. There is no reason to think that there's a more extreme meteorological difference. And so we could conclude that in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2062 increase in consumptive use. Doctor, what steps did you take to assure yourself that this was a fair comparison? Oh, yes. So, I mean, I looked at all obviously looked at all the discharge records, looked at the precipitation records. And obviously every year is different. So it's not that they are perfectly overlapped. But in looking at all the data, these are quite reasonable years to make this comparison. Now, I know there's been so many numbers flying around. Is this the product of is table 1 the product of a modeling exercise? No. These are data. These are just objective data taken from the Livneh dataset and the USGS discharge data. What's the Livneh dataset? I'm sorry. The Livneh dataset is this gridded dataset that can be downloaded from the NOAA website. And it is basically the scaling of objective rainfall data to a grid to make it useful for watershed studies. And Livneh was the lead author of the of the data product. I have heard you mention grid a few times. What is the relationship between gridded climate data THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Α.	2064 if I have that right. Could you explain those two types of droughts and the distinction between them? Yes. So when we talk about a meteorological or climatological drought, that has to do with rainfall coming in. It's, if you will, what nature gives us. And if nature doesn't give us too much, that's a meteorological drought. From the table we were just looking at, we could see that the level of meteorological drought in 1954-1955 was slightly higher than 2011-2012; but 2011-2012 also had low rainfall. On the other hand, a hydrological drought incorporates not only what nature gives us but what we take way, i.e., what human appropriation of water consumes. And that's reflected hydrologically. And so the hydrological drought is reflected in the June to September streamflow on this table. In other words and that's part of my comparison. There is no reason to think that there's a more extreme meteorological drought in 2011-2012. In fact, quite the opposite. But nevertheless, there's a big hydrological difference. And so we could conclude that in THE REPORTING GROUP

		2065			2067
1		2011-2012 there definitely was a hydrological	1		evapotranspiration, by not by consumptive use
2		drought, but we attribute that to consumptive	2		because I only used it for natural conditions,
3		use.	3		evapotranspiration, how much is in the goes to
4	Q.	And what is the importance of this distinction to	4		the stream.
5		this case?	5		And so what I did was to calibrate that
6	Α.	The way I look at it, the meteorological drought,	6		model. And, in particular, my calibration had a
7		what nature gives us, is really fairly what we	7		focus on low flows because we are most concerned
8		should be thinking of as the available quantity	8		in this case not with overall flows, not with
9		of water and not the hydrological response, which	9		peak flows caused by hurricanes, let's say, but
10		already incorporates everything that's been taken	10		by we're concerned with the low flows. And so
11		out.	11		I calibrated with particular attention to the low
12	Q.	Doctor, I think you're aware that Dr. Bedient, an	12		flows.
13		expert for Georgia, argues that the lower flows	13		One can then use a calibrated model and
14		the last 16 years are because of low rainfall.	14		extend that into the post post-calibration
15		What is your response to that argument?	15		period, the post-impact period. And you get a
16	Α.	One all one has to do is look at the rainfall	16		calculation of what the flow would have been
17		for modern years. And you see that that that	17		it's a calculation an estimate of what the
18		just doesn't make sense.	18		flow would have been had there not been increases
19		Dennis Lettenmaier Dr. Lettenmaier is	19		in consumptive use.
20		another expert in this case; and he'll be	20		And so what we can do with that is then look
21		testifying next week, I believe. And he is an	21		at those differences, look at that change
22		expert on climate.	22		detection. Did the change occur? Yes. If it
23		I have looked at the data. I have calculated	23		did, we can use those that modelled output to
24		what is called a standardized precipitation	24		calculate what the magnitude of that change is.
25		index. It's a technical term, but it's basically	25	Q.	I heard you use the word tools or tool there a
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2066			2068
1		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that	1		2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a
1 2		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in	1 2		2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist?
1 2 3		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive	1 2 3	Α.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method
1 2 3 4		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion.	1 2 3 4	А.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are
1 2 3 4 5		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the	1 2 3 4 5	A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages.
1 2 3 4 5 6		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	А. Q. А.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	А. Q. А.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	А. Q. А.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that we use to detect change. And the way we do that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А. Q. А.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper by Jaramillo and Destouni, J A R A M I L L O and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that we use to detect change. And the way we do that is to follow the water.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper by Jaramillo and Destouni, J A R A M I L L O and D E S T O U N I. These are the names of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that we use to detect change. And the way we do that is to follow the water. So the model computationally keeps track of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper by Jaramillo and Destouni, J A R A M I L L O and D E S T O U N I. These are the names of the people. This was a paper a report published
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that we use to detect change. And the way we do that is to follow the water. So the model computationally keeps track of how much water is coming in. It does	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper by Jaramillo and Destouni, J A R A M I L L O and D E S T O U N I. These are the names of the people. This was a paper a report published in <i>Science</i> magazine, one of the top scientific
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that we use to detect change. And the way we do that is to follow the water. So the model computationally keeps track of how much water is coming in. It does calculations as to how much water is going out by	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper by Jaramillo and Destouni, J A R A M I L L O and D E S T O U N I. These are the names of the people. This was a paper a report published in <i>Science</i> magazine, one of the top scientific journals in the world. And quite independently,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2066 a measure of the rainfall. And one can see that there really isn't any systematic change in rainfall. And Dr. Lettenmaier has done extensive analyses and come to the same conclusion. So I certainly do not believe that the differences between the 1954, the historical period, and the modern period can be explained by climate changes. Sir, what would you ascribe those changes to between those historic droughts and the modern droughts? There isn't any conclusion that I think anyone who objectively looks at this can come to save that it is consumptive use in the ACF Basin. And for what purpose did you use I'm going to turn now to one of the models. For what purpose did you use the PRMS model that you that you had some questions on this morning? So, again, the rainfall runoff models are tools that we use. And in this case, it's a tool that we use to detect change. And the way we do that is to follow the water. So the model computationally keeps track of how much water is coming in. It does calculations as to how much water is going out by THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	2068 couple times. What does that term mean to a hydrologist? So it's basically a methodology. It is a method of doing a calculation. Typically these are encoded in computer languages. Did to what extent did you apply different tools, different methodologies in your work for on this case? So oh, of course, we as we just discussed, we looked at data very much, as much as we could in every way that we could think of to look at the data because we really believed that the data formed the bedrock. But we used the PRMS model; but we also looked at the calculation I looked at calculations that other people did. And so Dr. Lettenmaier also exercised a model. He has a model that's called the variable infiltration capacity model or VIC. And he finds very similar things. We looked I looked at there was a paper by Jaramillo and Destouni, J A R A M I L L O and D E S T O U N I. These are the names of the people. This was a paper a report published in <i>Science</i> magazine, one of the top scientific journals in the world. And quite independently, THE REPORTING GROUP
		2069			2071
---	----------	--	---	----------------------	---
1		they looked at basins around the world. And they	1	Α.	So in terms of the computer models, for about 50
2		came to a very similar conclusion that I did with	2		years. I think Norm Crawford and Ray Linsley
3		my modeling and a very comparable level.	3		first published the Stanford Watershed Model in,
4		So we have a series of models. And the	4		if my memory serves me correctly, 1966. And that
5		all of these models point to the same result.	5		was I think that was the very first digital
6		And all of them agree with multiple ways we	6		computer model for a basin for a water balance.
7		looked at the data as well. So we we tried to	7	Q.	I'm sorry. You mentioned a gentleman. Who was
8		build this as a almost a weight of evidence.	8		that?
9		We looked at every avenue to see if there were	9	Α.	Oh, Crawford did his Ph.D. at Stanford; and
10		differences. And amazingly, everything kept	10		Professor Ray Linsley was a famous hydrologist at
11		pointing to the roughly the same impact.	11		Stanford at the time.
12	Q.	And you mentioned with regard to the PRMS can	12	Q.	And turning back to your particular model, how
13		I call it the PRMS	13		could one use your PRMS model to make an estimate
14	Α.	Yes.	14		of the impacts to the rivers from Georgia's
15	Q.	P R M S?	15		consumption?
16		With regard to the PRMS model, a technique	16	Α.	So we basically we followed the procedure that
17		called change detection. What is that?	17		I just said, do change detection, find what the
18	Α.	So in hydrology, as I say, what we do is if we	18		level of change is, and say that really is a
19		think there's been a change in the record, we	19		consumptive use. We then have to, of course, do
20		this is a typical hydrology methodology. We	20		some accounting because the ACF isn't 100 percent
21		calibrate the model before we think there's been	21		in Georgia And so one has to account for the
22		any change and forecast going forward and compare	22		non-Georgia part. One has to account for added
23		what actually hannened that's the data with	23		evanoration from federal reservoirs
24		what the model calculates And one can then look	24		And so again it's still a it's still in
25		at these differences	25		the level of accounting to do this calculation or
20			25		
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
1		Mason & Lockhart 2070	1		Mason & Lockhart 2072
1		Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between	1		Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use
1 2 3		Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aron't perfect. But we can basically look	1 2 3	0	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been.
1 2 3		Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look	1 2 3	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your profiled direct
1 2 3 4		Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant	1 2 3 4	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct.
1 2 3 4 5	0	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection.	1 2 3 4 5	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the screen flow donlation is the piece that ion't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. And the PRMS model is just a methodology, a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. Mather DRMS model is just a methodology, a calculation tool, that helps us keep track of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drough? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. And the PRMS model is just a methodology, a calculation tool, that helps us keep track of the water in this water balance because it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. Mathe PRMS model is just a methodology, a calculation tool, that helps us keep track of the water in this water balance because it's basically an expression of conservation of mass.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of almost 4,000 3,900 cfs, which is a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	Dason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. Mather PRMS model is just a methodology, a falculation tool, that helps us keep track of the water in this water balance because it's basically an expression of conservation of mass. Water doesn't appear or disappear without a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table & in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of almost 4,000 3,900 cfs, which is a considerable amount of water, especially at low
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. Mat the PRMS model is just a methodology, a calculation tool, that helps us keep track of the water in this water balance because it's basically an expression of conservation of mass. Water doesn't appear or disappear without a process.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of almost 4,000 3,900 cfs, which is a considerable amount of water, especially at low flow.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. Mot the PRMS model is just a methodology, a calculation tool, that helps us keep track of the water in this water balance because it's basically an expression of conservation of mass. Water doesn't appear or disappear without a process.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of almost 4,000 3,900 cfs, which is a considerable amount of water, especially at low flow. And where where on your map over here is that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A.	Dason & Lockhart 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's coming out. That's called a water balance. Mater doesn't appear or disappear without a process. How long have these water balance models been around?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table 8 in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of almost 4,000 3,900 cfs, which is a considerable amount of water, especially at low flow. And where where on your map over here is that water supposed to be?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A.	Data Stockhard 2070 And, of course, you know, differences between model and data will bounce around. It's not models aren't perfect. But we can basically look and see if there is a statistically significant change. We refer to that as change detection. And you mentioned a phrase called water balance. Does that have any relevance to your PRMS? Yes. So the PRMS is a water balance model. A water balance model we have very few things. Hydrology may seem complex; but on my first day of class for undergraduates I try to convince them, look, a water balance is just like accounting. You keep track of what comes in. You keep track it's like a bank account. You keep track of what's there, and you keep track of what's chalence model so water balance. Mater doesn't appear or disappear without a model. A water in this water balance because it's baically an expression of conservation of mass. Water doesn't appear or disappear without a process. Mo long have these water balance models been acound?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2072 back-calculation as to what the consumptive use must have been. I would like to turn your attention, Doctor, to table & in your prefiled direct. We'll pull that up on the screen. I know you're familiar with that. Why did you put this table together? I used this table basically to illustrate for the years that I show what the again, remember, the streamflow depletion is the piece that isn't flowing due to consumptive use. And so I wanted to illustrate the magnitude of the streamflow depletion due to consumptive use. And what you see is there are many thousands of cfs. With reference to your table, could you fill that in a little bit for perhaps the last cycle of drought? So, again, if we look at, as a sample, 2012, we see 3,400 cfs depletion from June to September. That's an average. And you see a maximum of almost 4,000 3,900 cfs, which is a considerable amount of water, especially at low flow. And where where on your map over here is that water supposed to be? THE REPORTING GROUP

Г

		2073			2075
1	Α.	Right here at Chattahoochee, the Chattahoochee	1		reassuring to me the similarity of all these
2		Gage, Chattahoochee, Florida, where the basin	2		numbers. That gives me high confidence that the
3		drains into Florida.	3		results that I got from PRMS is very close to
4	Q.	And in your opinion, why isn't it there in 2012?	4		what we refer to as an ensemble average.
5	Α.	In my opinion, again, there is no reason to think	5		We in hydrology we find that if we have
6		that the numbers like this for roughly 4,000 cfs	6		multiple models, the average of the ensemble of
7		should be there except for consumptive use of	7		models is often a very, very good it's a very
8		water in Georgia.	8		good forecast.
9	Q.	And could you describe with reference to your	9	Q.	Doctor, you mentioned a common basis that went
10		findings here in table 8 describe what your	10		into creating table 7. Could you just explain
11		findings are for 2011.	11		the differences in the numbers between table 7
12	Α.	Oh, yes. So 2011 I'm sorry. So in 2011 it's	12		and table 8?
13		a similar calculation, 4,200 cfs for the June to	13	Α.	Yes. So the good point. So in table 7 this
14		September, and a peak depletion of 5,300 cfs.	14		is an average over what is a 60-year period
15	Q.	And I think, Doctor, you understand that Florida	15		roughly. So that 60-year average will include
16		is asking for a remedy from the Court on the	16		years in the 1970's and even the 1980's when
17		order of 2,000 cfs. Right?	17		the depletions would have been much smaller than
18	Α.	Yes.	18		they are in recent years. And so the numbers
19	Q.	And how does that request from Florida, how	19		in table 7 reflect that. That is a long-term
20		does that relate to the overall depletions that	20		average.
21		you ascribed to the State of Georgia?	21		And if we were to transpose those to the
22	Α.	Well, in its from this table, it would be	22		figures in table or the figures roughly in
23		roughly half in drought years and certainly	23		table 8, they would all be comparable.
24		hydrologically feasible.	24	Q.	I would like to go back to your February 29
25	Q.	And have you formed an opinion as to whether it's	25		expert report, figure A.7, and have that pulled
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2074			2076
1		a reasonable request?	1		2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning.
1	А.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically	1		2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just
1 2 3	A.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request.	1 2 3		2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct.	1 2 3 4		2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of	1 2 3 4 5		2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model?
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put	1 2 3 4 5 6	А.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	А.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	А.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Α.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	А.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	А. Q. А.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	А. Q. А.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	А. Q. А.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms of an average from 1953 to it's either 2012 or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to indicate low flows, and it's called the 7-day low
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms of an average from 1953 to it's either 2012 or 2011. I would have to check.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to indicate low flows, and it's called the 7-day low flow. So we look through the summer period, and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms of an average from 1953 to it's either 2012 or 2011. I would have to check. So we wanted to convert everything to a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to indicate low flows, and it's called the 7-day low flow. So we look through the summer period, and we look for the week where the flow on average
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms of an average from 1953 to it's either 2012 or 2011. I would have to check. So we wanted to convert everything to a common basis. So we did that. We did the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to indicate low flows, and it's called the 7-day low flow. So we look through the summer period, and we look for the week where the flow on average was the lowest. And that we refer to that as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms of an average from 1953 to it's either 2012 or 2011. I would have to check. So we wanted to convert everything to a common basis. So we did that. We did the average from 1953 to 2012. And it's very	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to indicate low flows, and it's called the 7-day low flow. So we look through the summer period, and we look for the week where the flow on average was the lowest. And that we refer to that as the 7-day low flow. And that's a statistic that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	2074 a reasonable request? In my estimation it's very much a hydrologically reasonable request. Could we turn to table 7 of your prefiled direct. And here, I think maybe you described some of this, but I thought it might be useful to put this up just for a minute and have you speak to it. Why did you prepare table 7, Doctor? Yes. So, again, you know, what I wanted to do was in science, of course, you're always concerned about whether your results are consistent with anything that is related done by others. And so in this table you can see that Dr. Lettenmaier gave me the first things there. I already said the VIC, variable infiltration capacity, model is one that he uses. And I also mentioned Jaramillo and Destouni, which is a completely independent estimate. And Jaramillo and Destouni had produced their result in terms of an average from 1953 to it's either 2012 or 2011. I would have to check. So we wanted to convert everything to a common basis. So we did that. We did the average from 1953 to 2012. And it's very THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A.	2076 up. That was in Ms. Allon's binder this morning. And figure A.7 appendix 7 let me just ask you a prefatory question, which is this is about the calibration of the PRMS. Why did you recalibrate the PRMS model? So yes. So Ms. Allon referred to the USGS PRMS model. Often, and especially if you really are interested in the highest flows, that's what you focus on matching in a calibration procedure. Because we were very interested in low flows, we wanted to have a balance between high flow calibration and low flow calibration. And we really focused strongly on getting the low flows to be representative as well as we could because we knew that that's really what this matter is all about. And did you accomplish that to your satisfaction? Yes, yes. We worked at it and there is the exhibit, the figure that's up now. And what you see here is a statistic that is often used to indicate low flows, and it's called the 7-day low flow. So we look through the summer period, and we look for the week where the flow on average was the lowest. And that we refer to that as the 7-day low flow. And that's a statistic that THE REPORTING GROUP

		2077			2079
1		is used a metric that is used in a lot of	1	Q.	So you mentioned 7-day low flows as a metric.
2		regulations even.	2	Α.	Yes.
3		And so we we looked at that as an	3	Q.	What do you mean by that?
4		indicator of how we were doing with low flows.	4	Α.	By a metric all I mean is that it's often used
5		And what you're seeing is the differences between	5		as even in regulation, as an indicator of
6		the model and the observed that's on the	6		value that you don't want to fall below, as an
7		vertical axis versus the year. And I have	7		example.
8		highlighted in red the where the where we	8	Q.	And you mentioned that those metrics show up in a
9		had low flow conditions, where you observed 7-day	9		lot of regulations. What kind of regulations?
10		low flow was less than 7,000 cfs. And what you	10	Α.	Oh, they show up, for example, in some EPA
11		see is that the the model differences the	11		regulations looking at water quality concerns.
12		differences between model and observed is	12		And so when there's permitting done for
13		actually quite small for those particular years.	13		discharges, it often relates it refers to the
14		In other words, we were doing a good job in the	14		7-day low flows.
15		low flow years.	15	Q.	Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan?
16	Q.	And for some of the larger differences on the	16	Α.	Moderately so. I didn't commit it to memory.
17		blue bars, what is driving the differences in	17	Q.	That's JX-21. It's a
18		those years?	18		MR. SINGARELLA: If you can hand that
19	Α.	Well, I know for a fact from looking at some of	19		out.
20		the information, if you recall this is, of	20		Thanks.
21		course, in Florida; and Florida is subject to	21		May I approach, your Honor?
22		hurricanes. And some of these occurred at times	22		THE WITNESS: I think you can see, your
23		when the flow in the Apalachicola the recorded	23		Honor, why I didn't commit it to memory.
24		flow was very large, indeed.	24	BY	MR. SINGARELLA:
25		And, again, we weren't really trying to only	25	Q.	Can we turn to and you recognize this as the
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2078			2080
1		2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a	1		2080 Flint River Plan
1 2		2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a	1	А.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes.
1 2 3		2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model.	1 2 3	A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case?
1 2 3 4	Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model?	1 2 3 4	A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. Q. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. Q. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against the calibration for the rainfall runoff model	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am familiar with those criteria.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against the calibration for the rainfall runoff model incorporated into Georgia's official plan?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am familiar with those criteria. And what are they, Doctor?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against the calibration for the rainfall runoff model incorporated into Georgia's official plan? At the risk of patting myself on the back, I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am familiar with those criteria. And what are they, Doctor? So these are, again, people who got together,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against the calibration for the rainfall runoff model incorporated into Georgia's official plan? At the risk of patting myself on the back, I looked at the results and think that we have done	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am familiar with those criteria. And what are they, Doctor? So these are, again, people who got together, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; I believe, if I'm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against the calibration for the rainfall runoff model incorporated into Georgia's official plan? At the risk of patting myself on the back, I looked at the results and think that we have done a much better calibration.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am familiar with those criteria. And what are they, Doctor? So these are, again, people who got together, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; I believe, if I'm not mistaken, there was input from the EPA and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2078 focus on the high flows. We weren't building a hurricane model. We were building primarily a low flow model. And why weren't you building a hurricane model? Perhaps we should have been to avoid hurricane damage, but that didn't seem to be the focus of this case. The focus of this case we don't want more water during times when the flow is extremely high. Obviously, nobody wants a flood. But Florida really needs more water during low flow times, and we were particularly interested in change in those times. And does the State of Georgia rely on rainfall run-off modeling in its regulatory document? Yes, yes, yes. Everyone does. This is the way hydrologists do work. Are you familiar with the Flint River Plan? Yes, yes. They they report in that plan rainfall runoff model. And how does your calibration stack up against the calibration for the rainfall runoff model incorporated into Georgia's official plan? At the risk of patting myself on the back, I looked at the results and think that we have done a much better calibration. THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2080 Flint River Plan Yes. that you studied in this case? Yes. Can we turn to page 22, please. Are you familiar with the State of Georgia's technical findings in the Flint River Plan? Yes, I am. If I can turn your attention to the third technical finding there. Yes. Just take a quick look to refamiliarize with that. Yes, absolutely. In the in the second sentence, there's a reference to low flow criteria established by the federal agency? Yes, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Are you familiar with those low flow criteria? Yes. Actually, I the yes, I am. I am familiar with those criteria. And what are they, Doctor? So these are, again, people who got together, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; I believe, if I'm not mistaken, there was input from the EPA and THE REPORTING GROUP

ſ

		2081			2083
1		the state agencies as well, but definitely the	1	Α.	Yes, I believe they are.
2		Fish and Wildlife Service. And they basically	2	Q.	The ones having been established by the federal
3		looked at what flows what flows were needed to	3		agencies?
4		be protective of the ecosystem services.	4	Α.	Yes. And I also see them as correct that they
5	Q.	And which ecosystem services were the subject of	5		were coordinated with U.S. Geological Service,
6		those criteria?	6		the Biological Resources Division, EPA, and the
7	Α.	So they were looking at aquatic habitat. They	7		agencies of Alabama, Florida, Georgia as well as
8		focused on things like, as I recall, mussels,	8		the Nature Conservancy.
9		other species.	9	Q.	And what is the significance of that to you?
10	Q.	And what is your understanding with regard to the	10	Α.	Well, I think that people agreed that these
11		use of the word established here in the Flint	11		were these established criteria were very
12		River Plan with reference to those low flow	12		reasonable measures, metrics to use for
13		criteria?	13		evaluating where we needed to be.
14	Α.	I think that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	14	Q.	And could I invite your attention to that first
15		put these criteria forward. They established	15		sentence. I don't want to belabor it, but there
16		them.	16		is a reference to the final version. Do you see
17	Q.	And later on down in that finding, there is an	17		that, sir?
18		interesting word, magnified, in that last	18	Α.	Yes, yes. In the first sentence they're
19		sentence. Do you see that?	19		providing the enclosed final version.
20	Α.	Yes.	20	Q.	I don't know if it needs interpretation, but what
21	Q.	The effect is magnified. What is your	21		is your interpretation of that first sentence?
22		understanding as to this finding here in the	22	Α.	Typically, I think of a final version as being
23		State of Georgia and their point about the	23		one that is not going that they don't envision
24		magnification?	24		revisiting. It's the final version. It's what
25	Α.	So, you know, natural systems, as we say, the	25		they believe, what they put out there.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2082			2084
1		climate rainfall is we have low rainfall	1	Q.	I'm sorry to belabor it, but there has been
2		years; and we have high rainfall years. So we	2		apparently some debate over that in this case.
3		will always have hydrological drought even	3	Α.	Ah.
4		corresponding to meteorological drought. But	4	Q.	Let me invite your attention to the last sentence
5		what is happening there is referring to the fact	5		of the second paragraph here on the screen. Do
6		that it gets magnified. The impacts get	6		you see how the authors refer to these guidelines
7		magnified of hydrological drought due to human	7		as having some relevance to flow regime features?
8		appropriation of water, i.e and consumptive	8	Α.	Yes, yes.
9		use, basically what I call consumptive use.	9	Q.	What does that mean to a hydrologist?
10		Water is taken out and, therefore, it's not	10	Α.	So flow regime features really means having
11	_	available to flow in the stream.	11		appropriate flows, particularly at critical
12	Q.	And are your findings consistent, inconsistent	12		times. They refer to structure and function of
13		with the State of Georgia's finding here in	13		the riverine ecosystem. And so there are I'm
14		No. 3?	14		not a biologist. There are critters that need a
15	Α.	Totally consistent.	15		certain amount of flow at certain times of the
16	Q.	Let's perhaps turn our attention to the low flow	16		year to flourish, and that's what they're
17		criteria being referred to here.	17	-	referring to.
18		MR. SINGARELLA: May I approach, your	18	Q.	And then further on down in that same sentence,
19		Honor?	19		there's a reference to maintaining the structure
20	BY	MK. SINGARELLA:	20		and runction of the riverine ecosystems. Do you
21	Q.	I nis document is FX-599 marked as a trial	21		see that?
22		exhibit. It was teatured in Mr. Perry's opening.	22	A.	Yes.
23		what are these do you know, sir, whether	23	Q.	And what what does that mean to you, sir?
24		these are the guidelines referred to in the Flint	24	А.	Well, you know, structure and function of
25			25		riverine ecosystems ecosystems, as we know,
		Νίασοη & μοςκπαπ	1		Mason & Lockhart

		2085			2087
1		are complex. They're built up of food webs of	1		Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee. The slide
2		different species. They can be damaged. We can	2		that I'm looking at is 1929 to 1953. And
3		have die-offs of species. There can be bad	3		these the period of record used for the
4		things that can happen to riverine ecosystems	4		calculation is 1929 to 1953. And what is boxed
5		when, you know, proper flow is not maintained.	5		in in red is what the criteria say for one-day
6	Q.	And to what riverine ecosystems do these	6		minimum at that shouldn't be exceeded. Okay?
7		guidelines apply?	7		In other words, it's a minimum one-day that
8	Α.	So this is this is for the ACT and ACF Basin	8		should not be exceeded in all the years.
9		Interstate Water Allocation Formula. That's what	9	Q.	At what frequency can it be exceeded?
10		the title is. So it's certainly for the ACF.	10	Α.	According to the these guidelines, never.
11	Q.	All three rivers?	11		It's not supposed to be exceeded. This is
12	Α.	All three rivers, I think.	12		this is a very hard criterion.
13	Q.	Top to bottom?	13	Q.	And based on your understanding of the
14	Α.	Top to bottom.	14		quidelines, what happens when these criteria are
15	Q.	Okay. And in this sentence here that you have	15		exceeded, these floors?
16		been describing to us, it seems that there is	16	Δ.	In terms of regulation, I couldn't tell you. I
17		some connection between two disciplines. Are you	17		don't know how these are or if they're
18		familiar with that connection in your discipline?	18		enforced. But from what I know about, for
19	Δ.	Oh. ves. very much so.	19		example, what Dr. Allan has reported, there
20	Q.	And what is that?	20		aren't good things that come from exceeding
21	Δ.	Well, the connection I mean, in many cases	21		these.
22	7.1	it's even a two-way connection. But certainly	22	Q.	What do you mean by that?
23		there is a one-way connection, and that is that	23	Δ.	Well there are there are critical habitats
24		hydrology has a significant impact on aquatic	24	<i>.</i>	And some of them for example, they have these
25		ecosystems You can nick any aquatic ecosystem	25		heautiful cypress forests; and they need to be
20		THE REPORTING GROUP	20		THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockbart			Masan 8 Laskbart
					Mason & Lockhan
		2086			2088
1		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And	1		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the
1		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural	1		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're
1 2 3		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection.	1 2 3		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive
1 2 3 4		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection.	1 2 3 4		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get
1 2 3 4 5		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that	1 2 3 4 5		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there
1 2 3 4 5 6		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to	1 2 3 4 5 6		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. BY 1	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. WR. SINGARELLA:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. BY 1 Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. MR. SINGARELLA:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. BY 1 Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. WR. SINGARELLA: Are you familiar with the information on Mr. Perry's slide?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening was to look at the discharge records from the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. BY 1 Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. MR. SINGARELLA: Are you familiar with the information on Mr. Perry's slide? Yes. I have looked at this.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening was to look at the discharge records from the U.S. Geological Survey. And he recorded the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. BY 1 Q. Q.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. WR. SINGARELLA: Are you familiar with the information on Mr. Perry's slide? Yes. I have looked at this. And could you please describe it, sir.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening was to look at the discharge records from the U.S. Geological Survey. And he recorded the single-day lowest flow which, you will recall,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. MR. SINGARELLA: Are you familiar with the information on Mr. Perry's slide? Yes. I have looked at this. And could you please describe it, sir. Yes. So this is, again, these guidelines	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening was to look at the discharge records from the U.S. Geological Survey. And he recorded the single-day lowest flow which, you will recall, was the table on the other side told you the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. MR. SINGARELLA: Are you familiar with the information on Mr. Perry's slide? Yes. I have looked at this. And could you please describe it, sir. Yes. So this is, again, these guidelines for natural flow regime; and this is for the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening was to look at the discharge records from the U.S. Geological Survey. And he recorded the single-day lowest flow which, you will recall, was the table on the other side told you the critical values that were not to be exceeded
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. BY 1 Q. A. Q. A.	2086 you want, and hydrology has a large impact. And so there is just this connection, a natural connection. I people talk about wetlands protection. There's a whole range of things that hydrologically are, you know, connections to ecosystems. So this is And is that do you understand that connection to have relevance to the riverine ecosystem of the Apalachicola River? Yes. I believe that I know I have spoken with Dr. Allan, who I think has represented opinions expert opinions he's an ecologist that there is a connection and an important connection to the ecosystem. Can we turn to another slide from Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand this out. YR. SINGARELLA: Are you familiar with the information on Mr. Perry's slide? Yes. I have looked at this. And could you please describe it, sir. Yes. So this is, again, these guidelines for natural flow regime; and this is for the THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2088 inundated. I traveled down there and had the opportunity to look at some of this, and they're absolutely gorgeous. But if they don't receive high flows at certain times, they get they get taken over by other species. And so there there can be ecological change, ecological harm. But I know that Dr. Allan has talked about mussels endangered species being endangered as well. Can we turn to the next slide of Mr. Perry's opening. MR. SINGARELLA: We're going to hand this out. It's the back side, Paul Mr. Singarella. Oh, it's on the back side of what we already handed out. I'll be. That's great. Doctor, what does this slide from Mr. Perry's opening tell us? So what Mr. Perry had assembled in his opening was to look at the discharge records from the U.S. Geological Survey. And he recorded the single-day lowest flow which, you will recall, was the table on the other side told you the critical values that were not to be exceeded THE REPORTING GROUP

		2089			2091
1		ever.	1		counsel. Where is that?
2		By exceeded it's sort of weird because we're	2		MR. SINGARELLA: Oh, I'm sorry, your
3		talking about falling below. We're not supposed	3		Honor. So we are on page
4		to fall below certain flow levels, so exceeded in	4		THE WITNESS: 3-6
5		that conco	5		MD_SINCADELLA: 2.6 Each chapter
5		that sense.	5		MR. SINGARELLA 5-0. Each chapter
6		And the yellow shading just shows the months	6		is starts with its own one, just to make
7		in which there was at least one violation. At	7		sure I get confused.
8		least one day was below the the specified flow	8		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
9		in the guidelines.	9		MR. SINGARELLA: You're welcome, your
10	Q.	And did you have an opportunity to look at	10		Honor.
11		compliance with these criteria in the historical	11	BY M	IR. SINGARELLA:
12		record?	12	Q.	So we're on table 3-1 here in the LFO Plan. And
13	Α.	Yes, I did. And they were, again, another	13		could you describe to me what this shows?
14		indicator. They were much, much less. Not that	14		MS. ALLON: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I
15		they never occurred, but they were much less.	15		just wanted to make an objection. Not only
16	Q.	So what is your qualitatively your comparison	16		is this discussion not in Dr. Hornberger's
17		between what we're seeing in the modern period to	17		expert report, it's also not in his direct
18		compliance with these criteria in the decades	18		testimony. So this analysis is being
19		aone by?	19		presented for the first time right now as
20	Α.	So clearly we're violating the compliance	20		well as its source.
 21	2	measures much more frequently, much more	21		MR_SINGARELLA: This is an important
22		frequently. And again it's all consistent with	22		document that Dr. Hornberger considered in
22		having streamflow depletions of several they and	22		his first report on this same. And what we
23		of of in these summer periods	23		heard this merping is that eventthing is
24	~	Concerns the the LEO Day. The the Lewise	24		
25	Q.	Can we turn to the LFO Plan. That's the Lower	25		
		THE REPORTING GROUP			
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2090			2092
1		2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source	1		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is
1 2		2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon,	1 2		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is
1 2 3		2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor?	1 2 3		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that
1 2 3 4	А.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that.	1 2 3 4		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case.
1 2 3 4 5	A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out.	1 2 3 4 5		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may
1 2 3 4 5 6	А.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench?	1 2 3 4 5 6		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. BY	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. BY Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BY M	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. ВҮ Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	вү м Q.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	А . ВҮ Q . А .	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ВҮ М Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	А. ВҮ Q. А. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ВҮ М Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. BY Q. A. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	вү м Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	А. ВҮ Q. А. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	вү м Q . A .	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	вү м Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	вү м Q . A .	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	вү м Q . A .	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	вү м Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ВҮ М Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	вү м Q . A .	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	вү м Q . A .	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan. And I invite your attention to table 3-1 of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ВҮ М Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred to earlier, I had used 2,500. And so the small
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan. And I invite your attention to table 3-1 of the LFO Plan. I'll call it the LFO Plan, if that's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ВҮ М Q. А.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred to earlier, I had used 2,500. And so the small board actually shows the the number of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan. And I invite your attention to table 3-1 of the LFO Plan. I'll call it the LFO Plan, if that's all right with you.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	вү м Q. A.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred to earlier, I had used 2,500. And so the small board actually shows the the number of times the frequency with which that target is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan. And I invite your attention to table 3-1 of the LFO Plan. I'll call it the LFO Plan, if that's all right with you. Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	вү м Q. A.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred to earlier, I had used 2,500. And so the small board actually shows the the number of times the frequency with which that target is not met.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan. And I invite your attention to table 3-1 of the LFO Plan. I'll call it the LFO Plan, if that's all right with you. Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Excuse me,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY M Q. A.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred to earlier, I had used 2,500. And so the small board actually shows the the number of times the frequency with which that target is not met. So turning back to your board, could you describe
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2090 Flint-Ochlockonee Plan. Was that another source of low flow criteria that you relied upon, Doctor? Yes. Yes, I did look at that. MR. SINGARELLA: We'll hand that out. May we approach the bench? MR. SINGARELLA: I invite your attention to table 3-1 in this document. Perhaps it's table 3-1. Table 3-1. Do you know when this plan was adopted, Doctor? I did look at that. The date on this is September 2011. I'm not quite sure when it was adopted. Adopted in the State of Georgia? Yes. Did it establish targets against which shortfalls and gaps could be determined? Yes, absolutely. That was one of the purposes of the the plan. And I invite your attention to table 3-1 of the LFO Plan. I'll call it the LFO Plan, if that's all right with you. Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Excuse me, THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	BY M Q. A.	2092 And one of the ways that Dr. Hornberger is explaining that everything is not fine is with reference to the objective criteria that he has studied in this case. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may proceed. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. IR. SINGARELLA: Doctor? So, I mean, just looking at the table, the reason that it's referred to as gaps is they're looking basically at an average shortfall of water. And then to me what I one of the things I focused on was the column on the far right-hand side, flow regime target. And so this is this is corresponding to the maximum shortfall. And what we see is that the target, if you will, for the Bainbridge Gage is 2,506. And you will recall that the small board that we referred to earlier, I had used 2,500. And so the small board actually shows the the number of times the frequency with which that target is not met. So turning back to your board, could you describe THE REPORTING GROUP

		2093			2095
1		with reference to your board the relevance of the	1		of the ResSim versus how the Corps operates its
2		yellow highlighting with regard to this State of	2		reservoir system. And the ResSim model simply
3		Georgia criterion?	3		calculates wildly incorrect values for the
4	Α.	So, again, basically it is showing the frequency	4		volumes of water in the upstream reservoir. So
5		with which this criterion is violated. And as I	5		even with the ResSim model, if you are getting
6		said, yes, there was a very severe drought in	6		close to the right outflow measured, it's for the
7		1954-'55; and we do see the criterion having been	7		wrong reason. And so the Lake Seminole model
8		violated there. But, again, what we see from all	8		really is to me the true reflection of how the
9		these yellow-colored blocks is just a tremendous	9		Corps operates.
10		increase in the number of times that the	10	Q.	I would like to invite your attention to a
11		number of months in which that criterion is	11		pleading in this case.
12		violated, at least one time since 1998 when they	12		MR. SINGARELLA: May I approach, your
13		started the Bainbridge Gage back up.	13		Honor?
14	Q.	The let's turn back to another topic from this	14	BY	MR. SINGARELLA:
15		morning, which is which is the different	15	Q.	Now, earlier today Ms. Allon seemed to be arguing
16		models the two different models, the data	16		that the Army Corps was the cause of the low
17		ResSim model and the Lake Seminole model. And	17		flows in the summertime of 2011 and 2012.
18		Ms. Allon suggested, Doctor, that you actually	18		I would invite you, Doctor, to turn to page
19		decided to refer to an inferior model. Doctor,	19		11 of the State of Georgia's pretrial brief in
20		why would you have done that?	20		this matter. Are you with me, sir?
21	Α.	I didn't.	21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	What did you do?	22	Q.	And do you see the second paragraph that begins
23	Α.	I relied on the Lake Seminole model. The ResSim	23		with the words, through its operation?
24		model is a planning tool. It requires historical	24	Α.	Yes.
25		data to actually exercise it. And in operation,	25	Q.	Could you just read that sentence to yourself,
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		Mason & Lockhart 2094			Mason & Lockhart 2096
1		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have	1		Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir.
1 2		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to	1	А.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes.
1 2 3		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps	1 2 3	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic?
1 2 3 4		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia
1 2 3 4 5		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules.	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State
1 2 3 4 5 6		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that they really did produce. And that then allowed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change. There just isn't anything around that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that they really did produce. And that then allowed me to assess, in effect, the extra flow that the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change. There just isn't anything around that. Thank you, Doctor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that they really did produce. And that then allowed me to assess, in effect, the extra flow that the Corps released over and above the minimum that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change. There just isn't anything around that. Thank you, Doctor. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 22 23 24		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that they really did produce. And that then allowed me to assess, in effect, the extra flow that the Corps released over and above the minimum that the RIOP had.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change. There just isn't anything around that. Thank you, Doctor. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Recross?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that they really did produce. And that then allowed me to assess, in effect, the extra flow that the Corps released over and above the minimum that the RIOP had. Dr. Shanahan has done an extensive analysis	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change. There just isn't anything around that. Thank you, Doctor. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Recross? MS. ALLON: Very brief, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		Mason & Lockhart 2094 when the Corps is actually operating, they have information on the day. And so what I wanted to do was to discern as best I could how the Corps exercised discretion that it is granted in the operating rules. So if when I think about it, let's say on July 1, 1984, what information the Corps had was the reservoir levels in all the upstream reservoirs, their expected flows into the reservoirs. And then they had the RIOP to calculate what they could release, the minimum flows they had to release. And so the Lake Seminole model is just a one box input-output model taking account of the data that the Corps actually would have had when they made their decision to operate. And we then used what I refer to as a one-step-ahead prediction model and said, well, okay, let's see if the RIOP rules, given all the data they had, actually produced the flows that they really did produce. And that then allowed me to assess, in effect, the extra flow that the Corps released over and above the minimum that the RIOP had. Dr. Shanahan has done an extensive analysis THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2096 sir. Yes. And, sir, what is your opinion on this topic? Is it is it the Corps that hurt Georgia during the summers of 2011 and 2012 or the State of Georgia itself? I don't believe that the Corps operates to provide minimum values of flow. They certainly have restrictions as to what they do. But the low flows the streamflow depletions are just to me, I have absolutely no doubt that this is largely due to consumptive use of water by in Georgia. And Ms. Allon strongly suggested that there has not been fundamental change of the hydrology of the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin. What is your response to that? I think that it's it's just clear, as I said, to anyone that looks at the objective data that there has been fundamental hydrologic change. There just isn't anything around that. Thank you, Doctor. MR. SINGARELLA: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Recross? MS. ALLON: Very brief, your Honor. THE REPORTING GROUP

		2097			2099
1		RECROSS EXAMINATION	1		as a remedy. Isn't that right?
2	ΒY	MS. ALLON:	2	Α.	Wait. I modeled a range of scenarios that were
3	Q.	Dr. Hornberger, on redirect just now you	3		hydrologically demonstrable. They were
4		testified that you understand Florida is asking	4		illustrative. But you are right. I did not
5		for a remedy from this Court of about 2,000 cfs.	5		model explicitly Dr. Sunding's 1,500 and 2,000
6		Is that right?	6		scenario.
7	Α.	That's what I understand.	7		MS. ALLON: Thank you, your Honor.
8	Q.	And you understand that Dr. Sunding, Florida's	8		Nothing else.
9		economist, has proposed in his direct testimony	9		MR. SINGARELLA: Nothing further, your
10		conservation scenarios that he claims could	10		Honor.
11		generate somewhere between 1,500 to over 2,000	11		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Doctor, will
12		cfs. Right?	12		you bear with me? I'm a laymen in terms of
13	Α.	Yes.	13		ecology. For example, I never heard of
14	Q.	And you discussed that in your direct testimony;	14		riverine until today. What is a riverine
15		is that right?	15		ecosystem?
16	Α.	Yes.	16		THE WITNESS: Riverine is just a word
17	Q.	Okay. Let's turn briefly to that discussion.	17		that refers, as you might anticipate, to
18		It's at page 56, paragraph 123 of your direct	18		rivers and streams. So they're ecosystems
19		testimony.	19		associated with with surface water,
20	A.	I'm sorry. Could you repeat the page?	20		flowing surface water.
21	Q.	Page 120 page 56, paragraph 123.	21		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
22	A.	Okay. I have it.	22		, Would you turn to let me find it, if
23	Q.	And if you look at about two sentences from the	23		I can. Bear with me for a minute, if you
24		bottom of that paragraph, your testimony is that	24		will.
25		you believe the scenarios of 1,500 to over 2,000	25		I'm looking at your prefiled direct
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2098			2100
1		cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his	1		testimony.
1 2		cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model	1		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better
1 2 3		cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that?	1 2 3		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an
1 2 3 4	А.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes.	1 2 3 4		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you	1 2 3 4 5		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one?
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding	1 2 3 4 5 6		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs scenarios. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there. It's the one in which you show the low
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs scenarios. Right? Right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there. It's the one in which you show the low flow for May through whatever it is, May
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs scenarios. Right? Right. You modeled five different consumption cap	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there. It's the one in which you show the low flow for May through whatever it is, May through September.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs scenarios. Right? Right. You modeled five different consumption cap scenarios, but you didn't model any of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there. It's the one in which you show the low flow for May through whatever it is, May through September. THE WITNESS: June through September,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs scenarios. Right? Right. You modeled five different consumption cap scenarios, but you didn't model any of the scenarios Florida actually proposes to this Court	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there. It's the one in which you show the low flow for May through whatever it is, May through September. THE WITNESS: June through September, your Honor. There is a table in the prefiled
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	cfs of measures Dr. Sunding proposed in his testimony falls somewhere between the two model runs I just discussed. Do you see that? Yes. And the reason you say you believe is because you never actually modeled the scenarios Dr. Sunding discusses in his direct testimony. Isn't that right? That is correct. And let's go back briefly to demonstrative No. 5 that we looked at this morning and that is in the binders, slide No. 5. And we discussed this morning that slide 5 represented five consumption cap scenarios that you modeled. Right? Yes. And if we look at slide 5, we can see that you did model a conservation scenario from Dr. Sunding of 1,000 cfs. Right? Yes. But you never modeled his 1,500 or his 2,000 cfs scenarios. Right? Kight. You modeled five different consumption cap scenarios, but you didn't model any of the scenarios Florida actually proposes to this Court THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		testimony. Sorry. I should have been better prepared. But somewhere in there there's an exhibit that shows your conclusions about the low flow. Do you remember that one? THE WITNESS: It was probably near the table. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes, one of the tables. THE WITNESS: Yes. It could have been either table 1, which is on page 20, or table 8 that is on page 46. But it I thought you said the prefiled direct. I'm sorry, your Honor. That's my February 29 report that you're looking at. Did you mean the February 29 report or the prefiled direct? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I knew, I would be there. It's the one in which you show the low flow for May through whatever it is, May through September. THE WITNESS: June through September, your Honor. There is a table in the prefiled THE REPORTING GROUP

	2101		2103
1	direct that's table 8.	1	THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor. And, of
2	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And what page	2	course, the other table that we referred to
3	is that on?	3	that's one of the reasons why I looked at the
4	THE WITNESS: That would have been	4	1954-1955 drought really a very significant
5	nage 46 But it's in the prefiled direct	5	drought the drought of record versus
5	page 40. But it's in the premied direct,	5	$2011_{-}2012$ So we're doing a fair comparison
7	looking at the February 29 report. Toure	7	between droughts that occurred in the past
0	I think it's at the beginning of that	0	and the droughts that occur now. And we're
0	hinder	0	cooing the strong lowering, the much lower
10	There it is	10	discharges in the river
10		10	
11	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER. OKdy. It's	11	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER. Do you see my
12	Again, this will show you how little I	12	concerns for concluded that Georgia's
13	Again, this will show you now little I	13	consumptive use is affecting the now; but
14	know. I have lived in Malile all my life, and	14	you're only measuring from May to September
15	And we were a we have a large field system.	15	or whatever the year the month is.
16	And we were we have a large field outside	16	THE WITNESS: Again, your Honor, of
17	our nouse. It turned brown. And then	17	they like continuous
18	suddenly in October we got deluged; and we	18	
19	got more rain in October than we had an year	19	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But your
20		20	
21	So my question to you is are your	21	THE WITNESS: Correct. Correct. And
22	THE WITNESS. But the income methods	22	the data go all year. It's just that I
23	THE WITNESS: By their very nature,	23	excised from the data the results for the
24	iooking at months, of course, we do see that	24	critical period for the ecosystem June
25	in our records. Typically, it's later in the	25	through September.
			Mason & Locknan
	0400		0404
	2102		2104
1	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up	1	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did
1	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola.	1	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical
1 2 3	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at	1 2 3	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period?
1 2 3 4	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012	1 2 3 4	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned own in Maine, of course, you tend
1 2 3 4 5	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for	1 2 3 4 5	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to got at least a little driver, not brown
1 2 3 4 5 6	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for	1 2 3 4 5 6	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still groop. But the river on the river
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aron't you going to get a different	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sum
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all yoar?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes, So we measure all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evanotranspiration. So the flow is lower in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through as or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or lune through Sentember because that's the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet in the summer the summertime is when
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult: isn't it?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that L chose to look at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Verv?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's THE WITNESS: Consumptive use ves sin
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's THE WITNESS: Consumptive use, yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Precipitation
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And so does it make a difference in a given year if	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's THE WITNESS: Consumptive use, yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Precipitation level aspiration level all of those things
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2102 autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And so does it make a difference in a given year if there's a drought, and you're measuring	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's THE WITNESS: Consumptive use, yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Precipitation level, aspiration level, all of those things affect it?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And so does it make a difference in a given year if there's a drought, and you're measuring during a period when there is a drought?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's THE WITNESS: Consumptive use, yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Precipitation level, aspiration level, all of those things affect it? THE WITNESS: All of those things affect
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	autumn but that the flows start to go up in the Apalachicola. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, look at 2011 and 2012 THE WITNESS: Right. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: for example. If you measure solely from May down, aren't you going to get a different result than if you measure all year? THE WITNESS: Yes. So we measure all year. But this table simply summarizes what the measurements say for May through or June through September because that's the we think the critical timing, the critical time for the river ecosystem. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, diagnosing causal factors of changes at the ecosystem level is difficult; isn't it? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Very? THE WITNESS: Yes. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And so does it make a difference in a given year if there's a drought, and you're measuring during a period when there is a drought? THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2104 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And why did you determine that that was the critical period? THE WITNESS: So the seasonality you mentioned, even in Maine, of course, you tend to get at least a little drier, not brown, but still green. But the rivers the river flow is lower in the summer because the sun is out, and you're getting evapotranspiration. So the flow is lower in the summer than it is in the winter. And so that seasonality in the temperate zone all up and down the East Coast is prevalent. And, yet, in the summer, the summertime is when all of the critters in the river grow. And so what they're sensitive to the most sensitive to is the flow in the river in this period that I chose to look at. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But you concluded that it was Georgia's THE WITNESS: Consumptive use, yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Precipitation level, aspiration level, all of those things affect it? THE WITNESS: All of those things affect THE REPORTING GROUP

Г

	2105		2107
1	it. And that's why we had to do this water	1	J A S O N, C Y P H E R S.
2	balance that I talked about. So we take into	2	MR. LEOPOLD: May I approach, your
3	account the natural values of precipitation,	3	Honor?
4	of evapotranspiration. And what's left over	4	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
5	is what we can't explain by those natural	5	DIRECT EXAMINATION
6	processes. And so it's the the only thing	6	BY MR. LEOPOLD:
7	left to explain that difference is increased	7	Q. Mr. Cyphers, I handed you your prefiled direct
8	consumptive use because humans are taking	8	testimony submitted in this case. Do you adopt
9	water out of the system.	9	this as your sworn testimony here today?
10	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel?	10	A. Yes, sir.
11	MS. ALLON: Nothing further, your Honor.	11	MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you. I tender the
12	MR. SINGARELLA: Nothing else, your	12	witness.
13	Honor.	13	MR. ALLEN: Good afternoon, your Honor.
14	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.	14	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good
15	THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.	15	afternoon.
16	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you,	16	CROSS-EXAMINATION
17	especially for telling me what a riverine	17	BY MR. ALLEN:
18	estuary is.	18	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Cyphers.
19	MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, is this a good	19	A. Good afternoon.
20	time for the afternoon break?	20	Q. My name is Winn Allen. I'm one of the State of
21	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Certainly.	21	Georgia's lawyers in this case. I have a few
22	(Time Noted: 2:26 p.m.)	22	questions to ask you this afternoon about your
23	(Recess Called)	23	written direct testimony, if that's okay.
24	(Time Noted: 2:37 p.m.)	24	Mr. Cyphers, you worked at the Northwest
25	MR. LEOPOLD: Good afternoon, your Honor.	25	Florida Management District in September of 2012.
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	2106		2108
1	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good	1	2108 Correct?
1 2	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon.	1 2	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir.
1 2 3	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we	1 2 3	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I
1 2 3 4	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to	1 2 3 4	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct?
1 2 3 4 5	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of	1 2 3 4 5	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June.
1 2 3 4 5 6	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's	1 2 3 4 5 6	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Please be seated.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Please be seated. Pull yourself right up to the microphone	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir. Q. And at this time, Mr. Steverson was the executive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Please be seated. Pull yourself right up to the microphone and please state your name and spell your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir. Q. And at this time, Mr. Steverson was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Please be seated. Pull yourself right up to the microphone and please state your name and spell your last name.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir. Q. And at this time, Mr. Steverson was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Correct?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 24	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Please be seated. Pull yourself right up to the microphone and please state your name and spell your last name. THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Brett	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir. Q. And at this time, Mr. Steverson was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. In the Ensure line time in the first in the second secon
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? THE WITNESS: I do. THE CLERK: Please be seated. Dull yourself right up to the microphone and please state your name and spell your last name. THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Brett Jason Cyphers. It's spelled B R E T T,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir. Q. And at this time, Mr. Steverson was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. In the From: line there is a the first name is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2106 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good afternoon. Counsel, for the record, before we start, the reference that I was trying to find and couldn't is on page 20 of Dr. Hornberger's direct testimony. It's table 1. And he had described it as bedrock data. That's just for the record. MR. LEOPOLD: Thank you very much, your Honor. Your Honor, Florida would like to call Mr. Brett Cyphers to the stand. THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give in the cause now in hearing shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you Goo? THE WITNESS: I do. THE WITNESS: I do. HI yourself right up to the microphone and please state your name and spell your last name. THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Brett Jason Cyphers. It's spelled B R E T T, THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 2108 Correct? A. Yes, sir. Q. That was a few months after you started there, I believe. Correct? A. That's correct. I believe I started in June. Q. Okay. I would like to show you a document from that time frame. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Here you go, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. BY MR. ALLEN: For the record, I have just handed the witness a copy of GX-455. BY MR. ALLEN: Q. Mr. Cyphers, do you see in the To: line your name is listed? A. I do. Q. And do you see also Jon Steverson? A. Yes, sir. Q. And at this time, Mr. Steverson was the executive director of the Northwest Florida Water Management District. Correct? A. That's correct. Q. In the From: line there is a the first name is ITHE REPORTING GROUP

		2109			2111
1		Graham Lewis. Do you see?	1	Q.	And scenario 2 examines two pulses, 10,000 cfs
2	Α.	I do.	2		for 15 days each during the dry season. Correct,
3	Q.	And Graham Lewis was a hydrologist at the	3		sir?
4		District at this time. Correct?	4	Α.	That's what it says in the summary; yes, sir.
5	Α.	Yes, sir.	5	Q.	And scenario 3 appears to be a range of pulses
6	Q.	In the Subject: line of this memo, GX-455, says,	6		ranging from 7,000 cfs in June, 5,700 in July and
7		water volumes needed to augment Apalachicola	7		August, and some other cfs's in some later
8		River flows for oyster protection.	8		months. Do you see that, sir?
9		Do you see that, sir?	9	Α.	I do see that.
10	Α.	I do.	10	Q.	Okay. I want to show you a demonstrative we
11	Q.	And as we mentioned, the memo is dated September	11		created, and all it is is it's figure 7 from
12		of 2012. Do you see that?	12		Dr. Hornberger's direct examination. That's all
13	Α.	I do.	13		it is. It's nothing new. We have pulled out
14	Q.	And you're aware, sir, that this lawsuit was	14		figure 7 into a demonstrative.
15		filed in October of 2013?	15		MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach?
16	Α.	Yes, sir. I believe so.	16		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may.
17	Q.	Okay. So the memo is about from about a year	17	BY	MR. ALLEN:
18		before the lawsuit was filed. Fair?	18	Q.	Have you ever seen this chart before, sir?
19	Α.	So it seems.	19	Α.	I'm not sure. I don't believe so.
20	Q.	Now, sir, this memorandum, if you have had a	20	Q.	Okay. This is figure 7 from Dr. Hornberger's
21		chance to review it, evaluates three scenarios.	21		report. And it reports total monthly consumptive
22		Fair?	22		water use in the Georgia ACF Basin from 1923 to
23	Α.	I believe so from memory here.	23		2013, and this is as calculated by
24	Q.	Okay. And each of those scenarios examines ways	24		Dr. Flewelling. Dr. Hornberger just reports it.
25		to supplement flows into the Apalachicola River	25		Now, I'll submit to you these are consumptive
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2110			2112
1		during the dry season. Correct?	1		2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts.
1 2	А.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir.	1		2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting
1 2 3	A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each	1 2 3		2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point	1 2 3 4		2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir?
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct?	1 2 3 4 5	А.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay.
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That is what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That is what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that? I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any Florida expert in this case that's asking for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that? I do. Okay. And do you see that scenario 1 examines a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any Florida expert in this case that's asking for supplemental flows of 20,000 cfs in the dry
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That seems what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that? I do. Okay. And do you see that scenario 1 examines a 20,000 cfs pulse for 30 days during the dry	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any Florida expert in this case that's asking for supplemental flows of 20,000 cfs in the dry months?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that? I do. Okay. And do you see that scenario 1 examines a 20,000 cfs pulse for 30 days during the dry season?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any Florida expert in this case that's asking for supplemental flows of 20,000 cfs in the dry months? I wouldn't know.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That is what the memo is saying. Right? That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that? I do. Okay. And do you see that scenario 1 examines a 20,000 cfs pulse for 30 days during the dry season? I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any Florida expert in this case that's asking for supplemental flows of 20,000 cfs in the dry months? I wouldn't know. And you're not aware of any expert that's asking
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2110 during the dry season. Correct? That's what it seems, yes, sir. And the memo also evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinities at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? I see that scenario 2 I see the Cat Point, and Dry Bar scenario 3 as well. So it's fair to say that the memo evaluates what impact each scenario might have on salinity levels at Cat Point and Dry Bar. Correct? It seems like that's what they wrote in the memo. I'm not an expert on these issues though. That is what the memo is saying. It seems so. And, sir, I want to just briefly summarize the three scenarios without reading the whole memo. The best way to do it might just be to look at the summary on the bottom of page 2. There's a couple bullets that say scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3. Do you see that? I do. May. And do you see that scenario 1 examines a 20,000 cfs pulse for 30 days during the dry season? I do. THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2112 use numbers compiled by Florida's experts. Georgia does not agree with them, but I'm putting them up just to ask you some questions about them. Okay, sir? Okay. Do you see, sir, that in the two highest years and I'll walk over and point them out in a second that there are peaks at around 5,000 cfs? I see that on the chart; yes, sir. Right up here, sir? Yes. Okay. And do you also see, sir, that the next the next lowest down, there are some that for total amount of consumptive water use in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin, they're around 4,500 cfs? Do you see that, sir, right here? I do. Okay. And looking back, sir, at GX-455 in the scenarios we discussed, are you aware of any Florida expert in this case that's asking for suplemental flows of 20,000 cfs in the dry months? I wouldn't know. And you're not aware of any expert that's asking <u>THE REPORTING GROUP</u>

		2113			2115
1		for 10,000 cfs supplemental flows during the dry	1		cite FX-862a. And I would like to show you that
2		months?	2		document and ask you some questions about it, if
3	Α.	Not that I not that I'm aware of.	3		I might.
4	Q.	Not that you're aware of.	4		MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach?
5		You're also not aware of any Florida expert	5		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sure.
6		that's asking for 7,000 cfs during June.	6	ΒY	MR. ALLEN:
7		Correct?	7	Q.	All right. Sir, if you would turn with me,
8	Α.	I'm not sure what they're asking for.	8		please, to page 54.
9	Q.	Sir, looking at the same place at the bottom of	9		MR. ALLEN: And, again, for the record,
10		page 2 of GX-455, scenario 1 and scenario 2	10		we're looking at FX-862a, and I'm on page 54.
11		include some volume calculations. Do you see	11	ΒY	MR. ALLEN:
12		that, where it reports some acre-feet?	12	Q.	Just let me know when you're there, sir.
13	Α.	I do.	13	Α.	I'm on 54 now.
14	Q.	And scenario 1 is 1,190,000 roughly acre-feet.	14	Q.	Okay. It's a table A-4 that says Historical and
15		Do you see that?	15		Projected Irrigated Acreage by County. Do you
16	Α.	I see that number; yes, sir.	16		see that?
17	Q.	And scenario 3 is 1,789,884 acre-feet. Do you	17	Α.	I do.
18		see that?	18	Q.	And, sir, you're aware that this report was
19	Α.	I see that.	19		prepared by the Balmoral Group under contract
20	Q.	Sir, are you aware that those numbers are greater	20		with FDACS. Correct?
21		than the entire conservation volume of Lake	21	Α.	Yes, sir.
22		Lanier?	22	Q.	And, sir, on page 54 of FX-862a, do you see a
23	Α.	No. No.	23		line that says Jackson County or just says
24	Q.	And do you see, sir, that at the end of	24		Jackson?
25		scenario 3 it says in a little bracketed	25	Α.	I do.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2114			2116
1		2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable	1	Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document
1 2		2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should	1 2	Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated
1 2 3		2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of	1 2 3	Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that?
1 2 3 4		2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated	1 2 3 4	Q. A.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do.
1 2 3 4 5		2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements.	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it
1 2 3 4 5 6	_	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir?	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	А.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's loss than 32,2782
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County wear 2012, do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now. Sir, in your prefiled testimony, you say that most of the irrigated acreage in the Elorida	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County, year 2012, do you see that? I do
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now. Sir, in your prefiled testimony, you say that most of the irrigated acreage in the Florida portion of the ACE Basin is in Jackson County	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County, year 2012, do you see that? I do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now. Sir, in your prefiled testimony, you say that most of the irrigated acreage in the Florida portion of the ACF Basin is in Jackson County. Binht sir?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County, year 2012, do you see that?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	А. Q. Q. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now. Sir, in your prefiled testimony, you say that most of the irrigated acreage in the Florida portion of the ACF Basin is in Jackson County. Right, sir? Agricultural, yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County, year 2012, do you see that? I do. And you see 2012 for Jackson County lists 21,508 irrigated acres. Do you see that? I do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now. Sir, in your prefiled testimony, you say that most of the irrigated acreage in the Florida portion of the ACF Basin is in Jackson County. Right, sir? Agricultural, yes. Okay. And on page 10 of your written direct, you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County, year 2012, do you see that? I do. And you see 2012 for Jackson County lists 21,508 irrigated acres. Do you see that? I do. And, again, in 2015 now, there's 32,378 Do you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2114 section it says, this is likely not a reasonable alternative given volume requirements and should not be evaluated further. In reality none of these scenarios are viable given estimated storage requirements. Do you see that, sir? I do. And you recall, sir, having some discussions, I believe, with Mr. Lewis about how augmenting flows in this way would require Florida to build a reservoir I think I think he said the size of Calhoun County. Is that right, sir? That was my understanding based on my conversation, yes. Or Florida would have to construct somewhere between 8,000 to 10,000 ASR wells? That was my understanding, yes. Okay. Thank you, sir. I want to shift to a different topic now. Sir, in your prefiled testimony, you say that most of the irrigated acreage in the Florida portion of the ACF Basin is in Jackson County. Right, sir? Agricultural, yes. Okay. And on page 10 of your written direct, you THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2116 And you will see, sir, that in 2002 the document reports 13,374 irrigated acreages in irrigated acres in Jackson County. Do you see that? I do. And then if you look over at 2015, do you see it reports 32,378? Do you see that, sir? I do. So we can agree, sir, that at least according to this document, irrigated acreage in Jackson County more than doubled between 2002 and 2015? I'm not sure about that calculation. I know that it doubled between I believe it was 1987 and 2015, I believe. Okay. But if we just looked at the numbers from 2002 and 2015, do you agree with me that if you multiply 13,374 by 2, you get a number that's less than 32,378? Indeed. And, sir, if you look at the same county, Jackson County, year 2012, do you see that? I do. And you see 2012 for Jackson County lists 21,508 irrigated acres. Do you see that? I do. And, again, in 2015 now, there's 32,378. Do you THE REPORTING GROUP

		2117			2119	
1		see that?	1		irrigation in Florida has on river flows in the	
2	Α.	I do.	2		ACF Basin. Correct?	
3	Q.	That's an increase of 10,000 acres between those	3	Α.	No. But my based when you look at the	
4		two numbers. Right, sir?	4		entire permitted quantities though in the basin.	
5	Δ.	Between these two numbers, ves.	5		my understanding is from my staff that the actual	
6	0	Between those two numbers, that's a 50 percent	6		quantity wouldn't show up in the gages used to	
7	~.	increase between 2012 and 2015 at least as	7		measure the river. So it would be pretty small	
, 8		reported by this document?	8	0	I approviate that sir: but it's poperholess	
0	^	That's correct on this document	0	α.	true that the District has not done an analysis	
3	A.		3		the quartify the import that invication in Florida	
10	Q.	Sir, in your written direct at at	10		to quantify the impact that irrigation in Florida	
11		paragraph 55, you testified that there are	11		has on the river flows in the ACF Basin. Fair?	
12		about 460 irrigation systems in the Florida	12	A.	Okay.	
13		portion of the ACF. Correct?	13	Q.	Do you agree with that?	
14	Α.	Still getting to 55. Just a moment, please.	14	Α.	Not necessarily. I mean, the I said the	
15	Q.	Take your time.	15		analysis comes from the draw-down model. You	
16	Α.	Okay. I'm here.	16		have the actual users, say, of agriculture in the	
17	Q.	And you testified that there are about 460	17		basin at 26 million gallons of water a day.	
18		irrigation systems in the Florida portion of the	18		That's about 45 cubic feet per second. That's if	
19		ACF. Correct?	19		you take 100 percent of that from the river. So	
20	Α.	Yes.	20		in my mind, that seems like an analysis of at	
21	Q.	And I believe it's also true that the majority of	21		least to determine that there's not a meaningful	
22		Florida's water withdrawals in the ACF come from	22		impact on the river.	
23		groundwater wells in the Floridan Aquifer.	23	Q.	Okay. I appreciate that, sir.	
24		Correct?	24		You recall giving a deposition in this case.	
25	Α.	Yes, that's correct.	25		Right?	
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart	
		2118			2120	
1	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has	1	Α.	2120 Of course.	
1 2	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the	1	Α.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach?	
1 2 3	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater	1 2 3	A. BY	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN:	
1 2 3 4	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the	1 2 3 4	А. ВҮ Q .	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to	
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River?	1 2 3 4 5	А. ВҮ Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model,	1 2 3 4 5 6	А. ВҮ Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	А. ВҮ Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α. ΒΥ Q. ΒΥ	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN:	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α . ΒΥ Q . ΒΥ Ι Q .	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А. ВҮ Q. ВҮ I Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. BY Q. BY Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes. sir.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. BY Q. BY Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right, I'm going to read from line 3.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α. ΒΥ Q. ΒΥ Ο. Α. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Ouestion, And, you know, does the has the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. BY Q. BY Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Elorida done any analysis to evaluate	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use in terms of agricultural nurposes. And those two things	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. BY Q. Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Elorida has affected the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α. ΒΥ Q . Q . A. Q .	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. BY Q. BY I Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on narmits?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. BY Q. BY Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. BY Q. BY Q. A.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to guaptify any of these impacts	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22	Q. A. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. BY Q. Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. BY Q. BY Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. BY Q. A. Q.	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer during your deposition?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin. Correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. BY Q. A. Q. A. A. A. 	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer during your deposition? I did. I was just trying to provide a little	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin. Correct? That's correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. BY Q. A. Q. A. A. C. 	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer during your deposition? I did. I was just trying to provide a little more context for you.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin. Correct? That's correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. 	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer during your deposition? I did. I was just trying to provide a little more context for you. All right, sir. Shifting to another topic, as we	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin. Correct? That's correct. And to your knowledge, the District also has not done analysis to quantify the impact that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q. 	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer during your deposition? I did. I was just trying to provide a little more context for you. All right, sir. Shifting to another topic, as we sit here today, if an individual or farmer asking	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2118 And it's also true, sir, that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin to determine the impact those groundwater withdrawals have on streamflow into the Apalachicola River? We don't have a comprehensive groundwater model, but we have two different kinds of models that we use for agricultural uses in the basin. One of them is a draw-down model that we use for individual users to determine impacts on other users, things likes streamflows, springs, things like that. We also have AFSIRS. It's a regulatory model that we use. We input data, and it tells us what impacts or what we use in terms of agricultural purposes. And those two things together can tell us what impacts. And AFSIRS, as I understand it, is used in part to determine numerical limits on permits? Correct. But it's, nevertheless, true that the District has not done a comprehensive groundwater model of the basin. Correct? That's correct. And to your knowledge, the District also has not done analysis to quantify the impact that THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 A. BY Q. A. Q. A. Q. 	2120 Of course. MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, may I approach? MR. ALLEN: All right, sir. If you would turn with me to page 75. MR. ALLEN: And for the record, I have handed the witness a copy of his deposition. MR. ALLEN: Are you with me? I'm looking at page 75, sir. Yes, sir. All right. I'm going to read from line 3. Question. And, you know, does the has the State of Florida done any analysis to evaluate whether irrigation in Florida has affected the flows in those rivers? Answer. I don't believe that that analysis has done to has been done to determine to be able to quantify any of those impacts. Sir, were you asked that question; and did you give that answer during your deposition? I did. I was just trying to provide a little more context for you. All right, sir. Shifting to another topic, as we sit here today, if an individual or farmer asking THE REPORTING GROUP	

		2121			2123	
1		for an irrigation permit otherwise meets the	1		impose. Correct?	
2		permitting requirements in the District, the	2	Α.	We do impose some.	
3		District will issue that farmer a permit.	3	Q.	And some of those restrictions are voluntary.	
4		Correct?	4		Correct?	
5	Α.	If they meet all of the requirements to be issued	5	Α.	Yes.	
6		a permit, of course.	6	Q.	And the District has the authority to impose	
7	Q.	Right. And there is not, as we sit here today, a	7		restrictions that are mandatory as well.	
8		moratorium on new agricultural permits in the	8		Correct?	
9		Florida portion of the ACF Basin. Correct?	9	Α.	That's correct.	
10	Α.	I think that's partially true. We don't use the	10	Q.	And I understand the District imposed voluntary	
11		word moratorium, but we do reservations. So you	11		reductions in 2000. Do you recall that?	
12		can't withdraw water directly from the	12	Α.	Yes.	
13		Apalachicola River or the Chipola River.	13	Q.	Okay. And in 2007, correct?	
14		Also, as a condition of each permit, if it	14	Α.	That's correct.	
15		was determined that the use is having an impact	15	Q.	But the Northwest Florida Water Management	
16		on, say, another legal existing user or some	16		District has not implemented any mandatory water	
17		natural feature like a wetland or stream, then we	17		use restrictions since 2000. Right?	
18		are able to decrease their pumping if we discover	18	Α.	In the ACF Basin?	
19		that it's having an impact.	19	Q.	In the ACE Basin, sir	
20	Q.	I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you.	20	Α.	That's right.	
21		Lappreciate that all sir: but there is no	21	0.	So there were no mandatory water use restrictions	
22		absolute prohibition, separate and apart from the	22	~ .	in the ACE Basin in 2007 or 2008. Right?	
23		reservations we'll talk about that in a	23	Δ	That's correct	
24		second There is no absolute prohibition on	24	0	And there were no mandatory water use	
25		granting a permit for a new groundwater	25	~ .	restrictions in the ACE Basin of Florida in 2011	
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP	
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart	
		2122			2124	
1		2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the	1		2124 or 2012. Correct?	
1		2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct?	1	А.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct.	
1 2 3	А.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right.	1 2 3	A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept	
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water	1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels?	
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule?	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am.	
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure.	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Right. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Right. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure. Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Right. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure. Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about district-wide. There can be there can be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law also requires water management	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. Q. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Right. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure. Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about district-wide. There can be there can be water shortage rules issued for the whole	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law also requires water management districts to develop priority lists and schedules	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I <i>want to make sure</i> I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Right. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure. Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about district-wide. There can be there can be water shortage rules issued for the whole district?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law also requires water management districts to develop priority lists and schedules for the establishment of the MFL's. Correct?	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I <i>want to make sure</i> I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Kight. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure. Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about district-wide. There can be there can be water shortage rules issued for the whole district? Cartainly.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law also requires water management districts to develop priority lists and schedules for the establishment of the MFL's. Correct? That's correct.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Can I maybe see a if we're going to do I want to make sure I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Kipt. We can do that for each individual permit as well. Sure. Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about district-wide. There can be there can be water shortage rules issued for the whole district? Certainly. And there are restrictions that the District can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law also requires water management districts to develop priority lists and schedules for the establishment of the MFL's. Correct? That's correct. As I understand it, the priorities list is	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2122 agricultural permit in the water portion of the ACF Basin. Correct? That's right. All right, sir. Are you familiar with the Water Shortage Planning Rule? Generally speaking, sure. And the Water Shortage Planning Rule, as I understand it, allows the District to impose certain water use restrictions during times of drought. Correct? Car I maybe see a if we're going to do I <i>want to make sure</i> I'm not reading any documents, sir. I'm just asking you from your knowledge. The Water Shortage Planning Rule allows the District to impose water use restrictions during times of drought. Right? Right. We can do that for each individual permit <i>aswell.</i> Got it. Sure. But then I'm talking about district-wide. There can be there can be water shortage rules issued for the whole district? Certainy. And there are restrictions that the District can <u>THE REPORTING GROUP</u>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2124 or 2012. Correct? That's correct. All right, sir. Are you familiar with a concept called minimal flows and levels? I am. And that's a term used in Florida's statute. Correct? That's correct. And it's called MFL. Right? Yes, sir. And as I understand it, MFL's are the limit at which further withdrawals will be significantly harmful to the water resources or ecology of the area. Correct? That's correct. Mot Florida law actually requires water management districts to develop MFL's for specific surface and groundwater bodies within their jurisdiction. Correct? That's correct. And Florida law also requires water management districts to develop priority lists and schedules for the establishment of the MFL's. Correct? That's correct. As I understand it, the priorities list is THE REPORTING GROUP	

		TRIAL - November	10, 20	016 (\	/ol. VIII) Florida v. Georgia
		2125			2127
1		supposed to be based on the importance of the	1	ΒY	MR. ALLEN:
2		waters to the state or the region. Correct?	2	Q.	I'm handing you two exhibits that I would like
3	Α.	As determined by the governing board, yes.	3		identified for the record.
4	Q.	As determined by the District and the Board.	4		MR. ALLEN: All right. For the record,
5		Correct?	5		I have handed the witness copies of GX-526
6	Α.	Sure.	6		and GX-529.
7	Q.	Now, Florida the State of Florida began	7	ΒY	MR. ALLEN:
8		requiring MFL's in 1997. Correct?	8	Q.	Sir, GX-526, at the top it says Memo. This is a
9	Α.	Correct.	9		memorandum that you wrote. Correct?
10	Q.	And since 1997 it is true, sir, that the	10	Α.	Yes, sir.
11		Northwest Florida Water Management District has	11	Q.	And then GX-529, I believe these are the
12		had zero MFL's. Correct?	12		attachments to the memo that you wrote. Is that
13	Α.	That is correct.	13		fair?
14	Q.	You mentioned earlier the reservation on the	14	Α.	It seems like that's the case.
15		Apalachicola and Chipola Rivers. Correct?	15	Q.	Okay. And you wrote this, sir, as a policy
16	Α.	Yes, sir.	16		statement for the Water Management District.
17	Q.	And you also mentioned that in your written	17		Correct?
18		direct. So I want to ask you a couple questions	18	Α.	I think that's fair.
19		about the reservation just so the record is very	19	Q.	And you distributed the memo to certain
20		clear about what that is.	20		interested parties. Correct?
21		Before the reservation was imposed in	21	Α.	A few a few in particular that we wanted to
22		2006. Correct?	22		reach out directly to; but, yes, sir.
23	Α.	Sorry. I'm finding my way to the	23	Q.	And it included members of the press. Correct?
24	Q.	Okay. Take your time, sir.	24	Α.	That's correct.
25	Α.	Thank you.	25	Q.	And the memo discusses the development and
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2126			2128
1	Q.	Just let me know when you're ready.	1		implementation of MFL's at the Northwest Florida
2	Α.	Okay. I'm there.	2		Water Management District. Correct?
3	Q.	And the reservation was imposed in 2006.	3	Α.	Yes, sir.
4	_	Correct, sir?	4	Q.	And in your view, sir, at some point in time
5	Α.	Yes, sir.	5		there was a pattern of delays in issuing MFL's in
6	Q.	All right. And I just want the record before the	6		the district. Correct?
7		Supreme Court to be clear about this.	7	Α.	It appeared to me from looking from the outside.
8		Before 2006 there was no reservation in place	8	~	Yes, sir.
9		for the Apalachicola or Chipola Rivers. Correct?	9	Q.	And in your view, sir, during some period of time
10	А. О	inat's my understanding.	10		there was a lack of funding budgeted by the
11	Q.	And before 2006 there was no MFL in place for	11	•	District for the MFL's. Correct?
12	•	either of those rivers. Correct?	12	А.	It would for them to do MFL's, there would
13	A.	And the recomption applies only to surface water	13		need to be funding. We didn't see the funding in
14	ω.	withdrawale Correct?	14	0	And circ if you look down with mo at the
15	۸		10	ч.	And, sir, if you look down with the at the
17	<u>д</u> .	It does not apply to groundwater withdrawals	10		you soo that?
18	α.	Correct2	12	Δ	On the front part of the memo?
10	Δ	Picht	10	<u> </u>	Ves It's the first page. It's the second
20	0	And the reservation only applies to withdrawals	20	α.	naragraph from the bottom. Do you see that?
21	ч.	from the mainstem of the Analachicola or Chinola	21	Δ	Second from the bottom? Yes
22		Rivers Correct?	22	0	And the paragraph reads, the pattern of delays
23	Δ	That's correct.	23	ω.	continued until Governor Scott took office and
24	0	One moment, sir.	24		selected Herschel Vinvard as the Secretary of the
25	-	MR. ALLEN: Your Honor may Lapproach?	25		DEP.
		THE REPORTING GROUP			
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart

Γ

		2129			2131
1		And then it says there is a sentence there	1		At that point we get a little more I hate
2		about the letter was sent to the District asking	2		to use the term nitty-gritty with the data.
3		directly about the lack of MFL's in the district.	3		We'll ask for specific acreage data. We'll input
4		The District's response was that the law only	4		soil type information, climatic information,
5		required the creation and submittal of a priority	5		harvesting, planting seasons, whether or not
6		list, not the actual creation of any MFL's.	6		frost-freeze protection is appropriate for that
7		Do you see that, sir?	7	crop.	
8	Α.	I do.	8		And then we'll plug those data into what's
9	Q.	And then the next sentence says, it then became	9		called that AFSIRS model I mentioned a little
10		blatantly obvious that the Northwest Florida	10		while ago. I apologize for not being clear on
11		Water Management District had no intention of	11		the acronym there. So I will just say AFSIRS,
12		following the law and implementing the MFL's.	12		what I say is the smart guys.
13		Do you see that, sir?	13	Q.	And, Mr. Cyphers, do you recall what the AFSIRS
14	Α.	I do see that.	14		acronym stands for?
15	Q.	And at the time you made it in February 2012,	15		I think it's on page 14 of your testimony.
16		that was an accurate statement. Correct, sir?	16	Α.	Thank you. I'm sorry. You'd think being in
17	Α.	That was my perception of it, yes, sir.	17		government, I would be better with acronyms.
18	Q.	Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. I have no further	18	Q.	Paragraph 37.
19		questions for you at this time.	19	Α.	Sure. It's the Agricultural Field Scale
20		REDIRECT EXAMINATION	20		Irrigation Requirement Simulation model. That's
21	BY I	MR. LEOPOLD:	21		a mouthful.
22	Q.	Good afternoon, Mr. Cyphers.	22	Q.	And if the District decides to grant an
23	Α.	Good afternoon.	23		agricultural water use permit, what what are
24	Q.	You were asked about Florida's agricultural water	24		the requirements of those permits?
25		use permit. Do you recall that?	25	Α.	So in this instance, getting to kind of the end
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
					Mason & Eochart
		2130			2132
1	Α.	2130 I do recall that.	1		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of
1 2	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how	1		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it
1 2 3	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest	1 2 3		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to
1 2 3 4	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District?	1 2 3 4		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10
1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply	1 2 3 4 5		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be
1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First,	1 2 3 4 5 6		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А. Q. А.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases they move forward. Sometimes that requires their	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public interest, and it can't impact another legal
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases they move forward. Sometimes that requires their own modeling. Aquifer performance tests are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public interest, and it can't impact another legal existing user.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases they move forward. Sometimes that requires their own modeling. Aquifer performance tests are sometimes required. Those can be quite	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public interest, and it can't impact another legal existing user. And can you give your understanding, if you can,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases they move forward. Sometimes that requires their own modeling. Aquifer performance tests are sometimes required. Those can be quite expensive, so that's kind of the limiting factor	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public interest, and it can't impact another legal existing user. And can you give your understanding, if you can, for the Court what's included in the reasonable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases they move forward. Sometimes that requires their own modeling. Aquifer performance tests are sometimes required. Those can be quite expensive, so that's kind of the limiting factor for some applicants.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public interest, and it can't impact another legal existing user. And can you give your understanding, if you can, for the Court what's included in the reasonable beneficial standard?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A.	2130 I do recall that. Can you describe for the Court generally how water use permitting is done within the Northwest Florida Water Management District? Sure. It's a little different than public supply is done in northwest Florida in general. First, you would have a farmer that would come into the district, contact us seeking information about a permit, looking for a permit application. We would either try to do a preapplication on their property or at the district. That's to give an idea of what they're looking for, how much water they're looking to use, the conditions nearby. It gives us a decent idea to do a rough analysis on whether or not it's an appropriate use of water in that place and the kind of work they will have to do to show us that the use is appropriate in that area. At that point sometimes an applicant will decide not to pursue the permit. In some cases they move forward. Sometimes that requires their own modeling. Aquifer performance tests are sometimes required. Those can be quite expensive, so that's kind of the limiting factor for some applicants. DIE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q.	2132 of that AFSIRS process I guess that kind of logs in there what maybe you're getting at it produces a water quantity that's reasonable to meet maximum yield for a grower in 8 out of 10 years. And then two dry years, it would not be enough to meet the maximum yield for that crop in that soil for that time. So why doesn't the District give farmers 100 percent in dry years? Essentially we're trying to preserve the resource. And we understand that as things get a little drier, we want to make sure that we're racheting back on the use of the resource to make sure that we're not unintentionally impacting other legal existing users or natural systems. Do you know what the standard is, sir, to grant one of these permits? Yes. It's in statutes refer to the three-pronged test. It's it means a use has to be reasonable, beneficial, in the public interest, and it can't impact another legal existing user. And can you give your understanding, if you can, for the Court what's included in the reasonable beneficial standard? THE REPORTING GROUP

		2133			2135
1	Α.	Sure. And, sir, I'm going to try to find my way	1		know, just speaking with my staff, folks that are
2		to	2		hydrologists, scientists, are saying that the
3	Q.	If you want to reference page 30 of your written	3		use, even if you took 100 percent of it, you
4		direct.	4		know, wouldn't show up in the gage records for
5	Α.	Okay. It isn't on page 30. Do you mean	5		the river.
6		paragraph 30?	6	Q.	And referring back to the AFSIRS model, which you
7	Q.	Excuse me, paragraph 30 and 31.	7		have discussed, for granting agricultural
8	Α.	All right. So I want to make sure I've got it.	8		permits, do you recall when Florida first started
9		And there are a lot that are actually in and I	9		using that model to grant permits?
10		think we have the applicant's handbook here; and	10	Α.	I believe it was 1991.
11		it lists all the various things we have to do.	11	Q.	And do you recall whether it was used in any
12		One is to make sure that the actual purpose for	12		other context?
13		which the water is to be used is considered	13	Α.	I know that we developed it when I say we, the
14		appropriate under the circumstance. And in the	14		University of Florida, I believe, was the actual
15		case of agriculture, that would mean an	15		place of its of its genesis. But we started
16		appropriate amount of water for an appropriate	16		using it in 1991. I believe it was the basis in
17		crop for the soil type and climatic conditions of	17		the comprehensive study between Georgia, Alabama,
18		the district.	18		and Florida in the '90's to use potentially in
19	Q.	Does it have anything does the standard have	19		common.
20		anything to do with environmental values?	20	Q.	And I would like to reference Joint Exhibit 6,
21	Α.	Certainly. And that also stretches into not	21		which is the ACF comprehensive study.
22		impacting legal existing users. A legal existing	22		MR. LEOPOLD: May I approach, your
23		user is not just considered a person, but it's	23		Honor?
24		also considered natural features as well.	24	BY I	MR. LEOPOLD:
25		So if your withdrawal perspective or	25	Q.	Now, Mr. Cyphers, is this the study that you were
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2134			2136
1		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another	1		2136 referring to just now?
1 2		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something	1 2	А.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir.
1 2 3		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your	1 2 3	A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir?
1 2 3 4		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for	1 2 3 4	A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was.
1 2 3 4 5		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area.	1 2 3 4 5	A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the
1 2 3 4 5 6		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit,	1 2 3 4 5 6	A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has any impact on the Apalachicola?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in looking at various agricultural argument issues.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has any impact on the Apalachicola? I'll reiterate it, as I did for Mr. Allen, is the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in looking at various agricultural argument issues. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has any impact on the Apalachicola? I'll reiterate it, as I did for Mr. Allen, is the amount is so small and it's so spread out over	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in looking at various agricultural argument issues. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has any impact on the Apalachicola? I'll reiterate it, as I did for Mr. Allen, is the amount is so small and it's so spread out over the course of of the area of the basin that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in looking at various agricultural argument issues. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. Does the District monitor water use within the Florida portion of the ACF Basin?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has any impact on the Apalachicola? I'll reiterate it, as I did for Mr. Allen, is the amount is so small and it's so spread out over the course of of the area of the basin that when you look at the total amount of water you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 117? That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in looking at various agricultural argument issues. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. Does the District monitor water use within the Florida portion of the ACF Basin?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2134 post-permitting has an impact on, say, another well nearby or a wetland or stream or something like that, we would have to constrict your ability to use your permit that you wanted for that area. That's how we that's how we permit, hopefully to avoid that in the first place. But we make conditions on the permit that in case there's an impact in any way, that we're able to ratchet back that use. And counsel for Georgia asked you about Florida's water use in the basin. Do you recall that? Can you repeat the question? Counsel asked you about Florida's total water use in the basin? Yes. And he asked you about how you know, if you do, whether it's impacting the Apalachicola River? Yes. I remember. Do you know, sir, whether Florida's water use has any impact on the Apalachicola? I'll reiterate it, as I did for Mr. Allen, is the amount is so small and it's so spread out over the course of of the area of the basin that when you look at the total amount of water you THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	2136 referring to just now? Yes, sir. And this was cited in your testimony, sir? Yes, sir. I believe it was. And if you would, look at page 117 of the document, please. 1177 That's right. Is it one of these red tags that you have here? Okay. And do you recall, sir, the purpose for which AFSIRS was referenced in this document? It seems like it's trying it's pointing to appropriate irrigation levels produced by it for the Lower Apalachicola area, southern Georgia, northern Florida, southern Alabama. Would you explain for the Court, please, what the comprehensive study is to your knowledge? Generally speaking, my understanding is this is a compilation of work between the three states in looking at various agricultural argument issues. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. Does the District monitor water use within the Florida portion of the ACF Basin? It monitors use throughout the entire district THE REPORTING GROUP

		2137			2139
1		but, yes, the basin as well.	1		analyze their farms, and then suggest potential
2	Q.	And how does it do that?	2		improvements to those farms. We manage to save
3	Α.	Well, I have an entire I guess, first, it's	3		about a quarter of all Ag use from the work that
4		required in their individual permits the	4		those Mobile Irrigation Labs have done.
5		conditions of permits. We also have an entire	5		And in conjunction with that, we make that a
6		bureau at the District whose job it is to audit	6		requirement for those that also want to take
7		pumpage reports, inspect wells going in,	7		advantage of agricultural best-management
8		operations throughout the basin.	8		practice, cost-share projects with us. That's
9		The area where agriculture takes place is	9		where we pay part of the dollars to, say, do a
10		actually relatively small. So it's easy for us	10		center-pivot irrigation system retrofit. We
11		to physically cover those areas. But we all have	11		would remove, let's say, end-guns, do drop-nozzle
12		office staff that audit those reports that look	12		irrigation, those sorts of things.
13		for anomalies and potential overuse.	13		We also are doing an investigation of the
14	Q.	And if your staff finds an anomaly in the audit,	14		Claiborne Aquifer in the basin to see if we can
15		what happens then?	15		go to someplace other than the Floridan Aquifer
16	Α.	Usually the first the first thing they would	16		for agricultural use.
17		do is contact whether it was a public supply	17		We're also moving from the study phase of the
18		utility or an agricultural user, they would	18		sod-based crop rotation. And that's where you
19		contact them to find out if there was some sort	19		plant two seasons of grass; and then behind it
20		of measuring mistake, arithmetic error, something	20		you would plant, say, peanuts or cotton or
21		like that. Maybe something is broken. Maybe	21		something like that. And that, we're just now
22		there's been a large accident. That's usually	22		moving to contract with four growers in the basin
23		the first step.	23		to get them to do that. They will save 50
24		If it's found that it's not anomalous, it's	24		percent, sometimes 60 percent in water use as
25		an actual over-pumping of water, then we work	25		well as nutrient use with those types of
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		2138			2140
1		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that	1		projects.
1 2		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap.	1 2	Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots.
1 2 3		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so.	1 2 3	Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in
1 2 3 4		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good	1 2 3 4	Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin?
1 2 3 4 5		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take	1 2 3 4 5	Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440.
1 2 3 4 5 6		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send	1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to work with growers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back to paragraph 55 of your testimony.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to work with growers. Specifically in this basin they have them	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back to paragraph 55 of your testimony. MR. LEOPOLD: Mr. Walton, if we could pull up
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to work with growers. Specifically in this basin they have them throughout the state, but ours is works in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back to paragraph 55 of your testimony. MR. LEOPOLD: Mr. Walton, if we could pull up that page on the screen, please, paragraph 55.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to work with growers. Specifically in this basin they have them throughout the state, but ours is works in the basin almost exclusively in Jackson County.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back to paragraph 55 of your testimony. MR. LEOPOLD: Mr. Walton, if we could pull up that page on the screen, please, paragraph 55. Actually, and scroll down to the next page,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to work with growers. Specifically in this basin they have them throughout the state, but ours is works in the basin almost exclusively in Jackson County. Their job is to work with the growers, help them	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back to paragraph 55 of your testimony. MR. LEOPOLD: Mr. Walton, if we could pull up that page on the screen, please, paragraph 55. Actually, and scroll down to the next page, if you would, Mr. Walton.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q.	2138 with the permittee to reduce that use or get that use within their permitted allowable cap. Sometimes it's it's very easy to do so. We have really good growers. We have good utilities. But sometimes we have to take compliance, regulatory action where we send notices of violation. Sometimes we have to fine farmers and utilities. And has the District fined any individual water users in the ACF Basin? Certainly. It's not often; but I think in terms of fines, it's only maybe a few dozen times, 24, 25 times. Okay. Now, moving on, sir, beyond the permitting process, is there anything else that the Water Management District does for water use conservation and agriculture? Of course. We start with the Mobile Irrigation Lab program, which we do with the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Its job is to work with growers. Specifically in this basin they have them throughout the state, but ours is works in the basin almost exclusively in Jackson County. Their job is to work with the growers, help them THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	2140 projects. And, Mr. Cyphers, you mentioned center-pivots. How many center-pivot irrigation systems are in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin? I believe the number is 440. And do you know how many of those have gone through the program you have discussed? The number that's gone through the Mobile Irrigation Lab program twice that's where they go out. The scientists evaluate their operation, provide a report, offer suggestions, and go back out to follow up with them once they take some some of the suggestions. That's about 60 percent of the of those systems in the basin. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you have any knowledge of how many center-pivot systems exist in Georgia? I know our staff counted all of our systems in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama once. I think it's over 9,000. And if you would, I would like to refer you back to paragraph 55 of your testimony. MR. LEOPOLD: Mr. Walton, if we could pull up that page on the screen, please, paragraph 55. Actually, and scroll down to the next page, if you would, Mr. Walton. THE REPORTING GROUP

I

		2141			2143
1	BY	MR. LEOPOLD:	1		your testimony the geography of the basin?
2	Q.	And, Mr. Cyphers, how is it that you know or have	2	Α.	Sure. I mean, you move from more of a more
3		an idea of how many center-pivot irrigation	3		relief, higher areas, as you as you start in
4		systems may be in Georgia?	4		the top part of the basin. As you move down, as
5	Α.	Well, the figure here that was produced for now	5		others have more aptly described, Lee Edmiston
6		Secretary Steverson, but then he was the	6		being one of them, the areas get lower and the
7		executive director of the District, when he was	7		habitat becomes a little bit more lower, more
8		giving U.S. Senate committee testimony, my staff	8		marine, more estuarine.
9		at that time and also since, because they update	9	Q.	And what about the landings of the basin?
10		these things, took aerial satellite imagery and	10	Α.	Well, again, you can see there's the agriculture
11		hand-identified every single center-pivot	11		area in that part of Jackson County. I would
12		irrigation.	12		also note that of the entire basin, about a third
13		In Florida we were able to identify those by	13		of it 609,000 acres I believe is my
14		mapping them with FSAID, F S A I D, work as well	14		testimony is in conservation ownership.
15		as our own staff who know where the wells are and	15		That's between state, federal, and private groups
16		permits are for the basin.	16		like the Nature Conservancy that own that
17	Q.	And can you is that can you describe what	17		property. So that's unavailable for use, whether
18		this figure is that we're looking at in your	18		it be urban, although I hesitate to chuckle when
19		testimony?	19		I say urban in Apalachicola Basin, or
20	Α.	Sure. You can see the confluence of the	20		agriculture.
21		Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers forming the border	21	Q.	Okay. And, Mr. Cyphers, do you recall a question
22		between Alabama, Florida, and Georgia. The lower	22		that counsel asked you about MFL's and
23		part of the of the state line, you see the red	23		reservations?
24		dots above and below. Essentially, the red dots	24	Α.	I do.
25		represent a center-pivot irrigation unit.	25	Q.	Can you explain your understanding of the
		THE REPORTING GROUP			THE REPORTING GROUP
		Mason & Lockhart			Mason & Lockhart
		Mason & Lockhart 2142			Mason & Lockhart 2144
1	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.	1		Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation?
1 2	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the	1 2	А.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably
1 2 3	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF	1 2 3	А.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's
1 2 3 4	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it.	1 2 3 4	A.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin
1 2 3 4 5	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;	1 2 3 4 5	A.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are	1 2 3 4 5 6	А.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	А.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL process and I have been pretty clear about the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL process and I have been pretty clear about the District's policy since I've been there, that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL process and I have been pretty clear about the District's policy since I've been there, that it's important to, if lawful, to do. But in this case, we wouldn't be able to do
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin. As you move down in the basin, mostly you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Α.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL process and I have been pretty clear about the District's policy since I've been there, that it's important to, if lawful, to do. But in this case, we wouldn't be able to do that I would never even try to do an MFL on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin. As you move down in the basin, mostly you have small rural communities. They're not farm	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL process and I have been pretty clear about the District's policy since I've been there, that it's important to, if lawful, to do. But in this case, we wouldn't be able to do that I would never even try to do an MFL on the Apalachicola River because an MFL is a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin. As you move down in the basin, mostly you have small rural communities. They're not farm communities; they're mostly, you know, foresters	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the whole
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end up	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	Mason & Lockhart 2144 difference between an MFL and a reservation? Sure. In this case I guess that's probably part of the misconception in terms of MFL's versus reservations in the basin. In the basin they created the reservation because that was the only real avenue for protection of the water resource available to the District. The MFL process and I have been pretty clear about the District's policy since I've been there, that it's important to, if lawful, to do. But in this case, we wouldn't be able to do that I would never even try to do an MFL on the Apalachicola River because an MFL is a regulatory and planning construct. So the whole point is to determine what the level at which you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin. As you move down in the basin, mostly you have small rural communities. They're not farm communities; they're mostly, you know, foresters and rural folks like that. And where you end up is down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle area	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin. As you move down in the basin, mostly you have small rural communities. They're not farm communities; they're mostly, you know, foresters and rural folks like that. And where you end up is down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle area at the bay. And how much water use is there in Florida's portion?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impacting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida'sportion?I I think the total use permit actual use	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have some
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida'sportion?I I think the total use permit actual useis somewhere around 42 million gallons of water a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have somesort of regulatory authority; and obviously, I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida'sportion?I I think the total use permit actual useis somewhere around 42 million gallons of water aday. I think they're permitted to 69 million	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have somesort of regulatory authority; and obviously, Ihave no regulatory authority in Georgia.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 22 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida'sportion?I I think the total use permit actual useis somewhere around 42 million gallons of water aday. I think they're permitted to 69 milliongallons of water a day, but we haven't reached	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have somesort of regulatory authority; and obviously, Ihave no regulatory authority in Georgia.So then why did the District enter reservations
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida'sportion?I I think the total use permit actual useis somewhere around 42 million gallons of water aday. I think they're permitted to 69 milliongallons of water a day, but we haven't reachedthose numbers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have somesort of regulatory authority; and obviously, Ihave no regulatory authority in Georgia.So then why did the District enter reservationson the river?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart2142Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.And can you can you describe for theCourt, if you can, a little bit about the ACFBasin, given your familiarity with it.In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy;so I know I know my territory. These aresmall rural communities. Jackson County is theone you see right on the border of Alabama aswell as the Georgia border. That's where you cansee almost all the agriculture takes place in thebasin.As you move down in the basin, mostly youhave small rural communities. They're not farmcommunities; they're mostly, you know, forestersand rural folks like that. And where you end upis down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle areaat the bay.And how much water use is there in Florida'sportion?I I think the total use permit actual useis somewhere around 42 million gallons of water aday. I think they're permitted to 69 milliongallons of water a day, but we haven't reachedthose numbers.And can you describe, if you would, as you did in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have somesort of regulatory authority; and obviously, Ihave no regulatory authority; and obviously, Ihave no regulatory authority in Georgia.So then why did the District enter reservationson the river?That was that was the best we could do under
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A. Q. Q.	Mason & Lockhart 2142 Thank you, Mr. Cyphers. And can you can you describe for the Court, if you can, a little bit about the ACF Basin, given your familiarity with it. In in Florida I'm obviously a Florida guy; so I know I know my territory. These are small rural communities. Jackson County is the one you see right on the border of Alabama as well as the Georgia border. That's where you can see almost all the agriculture takes place in the basin. As you move down in the basin, mostly you have small rural communities. They're not farm communities; they're mostly, you know, foresters and rural folks like that. And where you end up is down in that Apalachicola and Carrabelle area at the bay. And how much water use is there in Florida's portion? I I think the total use permit actual use is somewhere around 42 million gallons of water a day. I think they're permitted to 69 million gallons of water a day, but we haven't reached those numbers. And can you describe, if you would, as you did in THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q. A.	Mason & Lockhart2144difference between an MFL and a reservation?Sure. In this case I guess that's probablypart of the misconception in terms of MFL'sversus reservations in the basin. In the basinthey created the reservation because that was theonly real avenue for protection of the waterresource available to the District. The MFLprocess and I have been pretty clear about theDistrict's policy since I've been there, thatit's important to, if lawful, to do.But in this case, we wouldn't be able to dothat I would never even try to do an MFL onthe Apalachicola River because an MFL is aregulatory and planning construct. So the wholepoint is to determine what the level at which youwithdraw more causes significant harm. But Ican't do that on the Apalachicola River becauseall of the impact, all of the consumption andharm is taking place in Georgia and impactingFlorida. And I can only do it where I have somesort of regulatory authority; and obviously, Ihave no regulatory authority in Georgia.So then why did the District enter reservationson the river?That was that was the best we could do underTHE REPORTING GROUP

		2145		2147	
1		the circumstance in terms of preserving that	1	MR. ALLEN: GX-529 has a number of	
2		water.	2	attachments. The last page, Page 529, your	
3		Now, it's not the only thing. Obviously, you	3	Honor, the memo is reproduced. So that might	
4		saw the conservation programs that we have	4	help a little bit in terms of it's also at	
5		invested in for the last decade, you know, in	5	the end of GX-529.	
6		terms of the best-management practice,	6	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.	
7		cost-share, and the studies and investigation and	7	MR. ALLEN: You're welcome.	
8		the Mobile Irrigation Labs. But in terms of	8	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything	
9		producing any actual water in the river, we	9	further?	
10		can't that's the best we can do.	10	MR. LEOPOLD: Nothing from Florida, your	
11	Q.	Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cyphers.	11	Honor.	
12		MR. LEOPOLD: No further questions.	12	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may be	
13		Your Honor, I failed to introduce my	13	excused.	
14		colleague Ben Stearns. He's been helping me	14	THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.	
15		with this exam.	15	MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, your Honor.	
16		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Welcome.	16	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry?	
17		MR. ALLEN: No further questions, your	17	MR. PERRY: Our expectation today was	
18		Honor.	18	that Dr. Hornberger might take all day, and	
19		SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Cyphers,	19	happily it didn't take all day. And we had	
20		the counsel for Georgia handed you two	20	Mr. Cyphers ready in case of that eventuality.	
21		documents, GX-526 and GX-529. And did I	21	He's now testified. We have witnesses I	
22		understand your testimony to be that 526 is	22	think one is Georgia's witnesses for	
23		the memo from you and that 529 is the	23	Monday morning. But for the next hour, we	
24		attachment to the memo?	24	haven't prepared a witness because we didn't	
25		THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.	25	anticipate the day would finish.	
		THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP	
		Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart	
		2146		2148	_
1		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me	1	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you	
1 2		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3,	1 2	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry?	
1 2 3		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3,	1 2 3	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am,	
1 2 3 4		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013.	1 2 3 4	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor.	
1 2 3 4 5		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit	1 2 3 4 5	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a	
1 2 3 4 5 6		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag	1 2 3 4 5 6	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It doesn't	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Have a good weekend.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It doesn't matter. Okay.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Have a good weekend. (Time Noted: 3:35 p.m.)	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It doesn't matter. Okay. MR. ALLEN: One thing to clarify on	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Have a good weekend. (Time Noted: 3:35 p.m.) (Proceeding adjourned to Monday,	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It doesn't matter. Okay. MR. ALLEN: One thing to clarify on that?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Have a good weekend. (Time Noted: 3:35 p.m.) (Proceeding adjourned to Monday, November 14, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.)	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It doesn't matter. Okay. MR. ALLEN: One thing to clarify on that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Have a good weekend. (Time Noted: 3:35 p.m.) (Proceeding adjourned to Monday, November 14, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.) (End of day)	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		2146 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, help me here because the memo is dated February 3, 2012; and the attachment is dated February 3, 2013. THE WITNESS: That's a that's a bit of a mystery for me. It may have been a lag in terms of me sending it to the folks listed here and when I maybe got permission from the executive director to deliver the memo itself. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: But the memo 526 is the memo? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And 529 is the attachment? THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. And it may it may have been a function of it didn't go through in some sort of technical aspect when we tried to e-mail it to these parties. I'm not I'm just not sure about that part. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: It doesn't matter. Okay. MR. ALLEN: One thing to clarify on that? SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. THE REPORTING GROUP	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	2148 SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: So are you suggesting that we should recess, Mr. Perry? MR. PERRY: In a long-winded way, I am, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's a wonderful suggestion. Thank you. Let me remind counsel, I'm sure you're aware, that tomorrow is a holiday and this office is closed, and that Tuesday of next week the Bankruptcy Court will be sitting; so that we will have a four-day week next week as well. I suggest, as I have before, that you use Alec's list of restaurants. The weather forecast for the weekend is great weather, so take your umbrellas. I suggest that you relax, enjoy, and be ready to roll on Monday. Thank you very much. MR. PRIMIS: Thank you, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Have a good weekend. (Time Noted: 3:35 p.m.) (Proceeding adjourned to Monday, November 14, 2016, at 9:00 a.m.) (End of day) THE REPORTING GROUP	

	2149
1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public
3	in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify
4	that the foregoing pages are a correct
5	transcript of my stenographic notes of the
6	Proceedings.
7	I further certify that I am a
8	disinterested person in the event or outcome
9	of the above-named cause of action.
10	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand
11	this 6th day of December, 2016.
12	
13	
14	
15	/s/ Claudette G. Mason
	Claudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR
16	Court Reporter
17	My Commission Expires
	June 9, 2019.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart

•	2030:13, 2036:25,	2087:2, 2087:4	1993 [2] - 2020:23,	2003 [2] - 1926:10,
	2053:14, 2054:12,	1932 [4] - 2000:23.	2020:25	1997:25
'98 [1] - 2033:10	2071:20 2119:19	2001:1.2001:4	1996 [5] - 2033-21	2006 [7] - 1980 19
	2132.8 2135.3	1935 [4] 2000:21	2035-6 2036-13	2036:15 2036:10
1	2132.0, 2133.3	1935 [1] - 2009.21	2033.0, 2030.13,	2030.13, 2030.19,
1	104[1] - 1955.3	1936 [1] - 2011:6	2036:20	2125:22, 2126:3,
/s [1] - 2149:15	10:17 [1] - 1985:25	1937 [1] - 1926:13	1997 [2] - 2125:8,	2126:8, 2126:11
	10:30 [1] - 1986:2	1938 [1] - 2011:13	2125:10	2007 [12] - 1933:11,
0	11 [17] - 1937:12,	1939 [1] - 1926:16	1998 [6] - 1974:9,	1934:17, 1973:17,
0	1937:13, 1938:5,	1940 [1] - 2009:21	1998:20, 2028:5,	1973:19, 1973:21,
0 [1] - 1957:3	1938 7 1938 17	1941 [1] - 2001:11	2035 6 2036 18	1974:4, 1980:19.
0 18 (2) 2054:16	1938.20 1938.24	104F (1) 2001111	2093:12	1992.4 2017.12
0.10[3] - 2034.10,	1020:20, 1020:24,	1945 [1] - 1926.10	1000 (5) 1000:2	2019:10 2122:12
2054:21, 2054:25	1939.2, 1939.3,	1950 [1] - 1974:25	1999 [5] - 1999.2,	2010.19, 2123.13,
_	1939.6, 1939.13,	1953 [4] - 2074:21,	2033:10, 2048:16,	2123.22
1	1939:18, 1939:20,	2074:25, 2087:2,	2050:12, 2051:20	2008 [2] - 1980:19,
4 4004.40	1979:19, 1979:20,	2087:4		2123:22
1 [32] - 1931:13,	1994:12, 2095:19	1954 [17] - 1974:6.	2	2009 [1] - 1926:13
1937:18, 1938:19,	117 [2] - 2136:5,	1976.14 1976.17		2010 [2] - 2020:23,
1939:18, 1946:2,	2136:7	1077.12 1077.18	2 [14] - 1933:18,	2020:25
1947:23, 1952:3,	11:46 [1] - 2042.7	1078-13 1070-1	1986:14, 1990:23,	2011 [16] - 1934 23
1952:6, 1953:7,	12 101 - 1086-13	1070.10, 1079.1,	2010:10, 2021:19,	1080.10 1002.4
1953:22, 1956:1,	1000·24	1979.5, 1994.9,	2028:11, 2036:3,	1004.0 1004.15
1956:25, 1957:14	1990.24	1994:13, 1995:4,	2110:6. 2110:18.	1994.9, 1994.15,
1959.20 1960.6	1 20 [2] - 1941:16,	1995:15, 2049:2,	2110.19 2111.1	1995:6, 1995:16,
1959.20, 1900.0,	2097:21	2049:3, 2051:5,	2110:10, 2116:16	2073:11, 2073:12,
1976:18, 1994:5,	121 [1] - 1959:3	2061:8, 2066:6	2113.10, 2110.10	2074:22, 2090:13,
1994:6, 2010:1,	122 [1] - 1959:3	1954-'55 [1] - 2093:7	2,000 [8] - 1983:23,	2095:17, 2096:5,
2023:1, 2023:8,	123 [3] - 1959 [.] 3	1954-1955 [3] -	1984:14, 2073:17,	2102:4, 2123:25
2023:10, 2054:17,	2097.18 2097.21	2060:25 2064:11	2097:5, 2097:11,	2011-2012 [9] -
2060:18, 2062:12,	124 [4] 1050:4	2000.23, 2004.11,	2097:25, 2098:20,	2051:3 2061:2
2094:7, 2100:11,		2103.4	2099:5	2061:10, 2061:19
2106:7, 2110:19,	12:50 [1] - 2042:9	1955 [8] - 1974:6,	2,500 [7] - 1980:16,	2001.10, 2001.13,
2110:22, 2113:10,	13 [7] - 2003:12,	1979:6, 1994:9,	1982:9, 1983:7,	2004.12, 2004.23,
2113:14	2003:16, 2003:19,	1994:13, 1995:4,	1983:11, 1983:12	2065:1, 2103:6
1 000 [3] - 1967.6	2004:1, 2005:5,	1995:15, 2049:2,	2051.14 2092.21	2012 [33] - 1935:4,
1067:15 2008:18	2005:15, 2005:21	2061:8	2 506 [2] 2051:22	1955:21, 1958:18,
4 400 000 4	13,374 [2] - 2116:2,	1957 [1] - 1926:11	2,500 [5] - 2051.22,	1973:18, 1973:19,
1,190,000 [1] -	2116:16	1963 [2] - 2001:18,	2051.24, 2092.19	1973:21, 1974:5,
2113:14	13.9 [1] - 2000:6	2001:20	2-63 [1] - 1946:15	1980:19, 1982:6,
1,500 [4] - 2097:11,	1389 [1] - 1942.7	1966 [1] - 2071·4	20 [10] - 1994:4,	1982:8, 1982:24,
2097:25, 2098:20,	14 rst 1001:7	1000 [1] = 207 1.4	1999:25, 2021:23,	1992:4, 1994:9,
2099:5	14 [5] - 1991.7,	1969 [1] - 2002. 1	2022:2, 2033:17,	1994.15 1995.6
1,789,884 [1] -	1991:9, 1991:11,	1970 [12] - 1971:14,	2035:2, 2054:19,	1995.16 2002.22
2113:17	2131:15, 2148:24	1972:2, 1972:6,	2060:16, 2100:11,	2003:2 2072:18
1/50 [2] - 2054:14	142 [1] - 1925:1	1973:11, 1974:9,	2106:5	2003.2, 2072.10,
2054.15	15 [2] - 2025:12,	1974:25, 1997:24,	20 000 [4] - 2011·10	2073:4, 2074:21,
10 100 1005-10	2111:2	1999:2, 2000:9,	2011.17 2110.22	2074:25, 2095:17,
10[22] - 1923.13,	15.8 [1] - 2061:9	2000:13, 2054:10,	2011.17, 2110.23,	2096:5, 2102:4,
1953.4, 1953.5,	1500 [3] - 1941:2.	2054:14	2112.22	2107:25, 2109:12,
1955:13, 1955:15,	1941.7 1941.13	1970's [1] - 2075-16	200 [2] - 2018:7,	2116:20, 2116:22,
1955:24, 1956:5,	153 [4] _ 1035·3	1971 [5] - 1007.25	2018:8	2117:7, 2124:1,
1956:8, 1956:17,	100 [1] - 1000.0	1000.20 1000.20	200,000 [1] - 2010:13	2129:15, 2146:3
1957:7, 1957:8,	159[1] - 1943:15	1990.20, 1998.23,	2000 [11] - 1933:25,	2013 [7] - 1997:25.
1957:13, 1957:19,	16 [2] - 2031:13,	2050:23, 2051:1	1934:8, 1937:22,	1998.23 2109.15
1957:21, 1958:6,	2065:14	1976 [2] - 1955:21,	1938:2. 1959:11.	2111:23 21/6:/
1958:19. 1975:1	171 [1] - 2039:23	1958:17	1959:14 1960.2	2111.20 , 2140.4
1978 17 1979 15	19 [5] - 1948:5,	1980 [1] - 2048:15	1974.15 1980.15	2014[1] - 2020:23
2010.11 2114.25	1982:18, 1997:11,	1980's [1] - 2075:16	2123.11 2122.17	2015 [7] - 1946:11,
2010.11, 2114.20, 2132.4	2001:1. 2048:15	1984 [1] - 2094:7	2120.11, 2120.17	2116:5, 2116:10,
Z 10Z.4	1923 [1] - 2111·22	1987 [1] - 2116·12	200 T [2] - 2050:23,	2116:13, 2116:15,
10,000 [4] - 211111,	1924 [1] - 1007·24	1991 [2] - 2135·10	2051:2	2116:25, 2117:7
2113:1, 2114:16,	102	2135.16	2002 [7] - 1940:23,	2016 [7] - 1925:13,
2117:3	1070-22 1090-2	100.10 1066.0	1941:15, 1941:20,	1997:6, 1997:11,
100 [13] - 1931:25,	1979.22, 1980.2	1992 [4] - 1900.2,	1980:19, 2116:1,	2031:13, 2031:21.
1932:15, 1945:15,	1928 [1] - 1926:3	■ 190000001900 - REDADUINA A	ROTTP:10, 2116:15	2148:24, 2149:11
1969:13, 2030:10,	1929 [3] - 1926:3, ⊥⊓1			· -
	M	lason & Tockha	rt	

2019 [1] - 2149:17	2100:17, 2101:6,	4	2098:13, 2098:16	60-year [2] - 2075:14,
2041 [1] - 1926:3	2101.7 296 [1] - 1997·7	4 [7] - 1946:15.	5,000 [11] - 1900.7, 1966:12, 1966:16	2075.15 609 000 (4) 21/(3·13
2050 [5] - 1937.0, 1020:16 1041:5	230 [1] - 1337.7 2:26 [4] 2105:22	1956:15, 1996:24.	1900.12, 1900.10, 1967:11 1967:17	603,000 [1] - 2 143.13
1959.10, 1941.5,	2.20 [1] - 2105.22 2.37 [1] - 2105.24	1996:25, 1997:22,	1968.25 1969.3	62 [1] - 2047.1 63 [2] 1033:24
1900.23, 1901.3	2.37 [1] - 2103.24	2002:20, 2009:19	1900.23, 1909.3, 1960:10, 1970:4	03 [3] - 1933.24, 1024:6 1047:10
2079 [1] - 1920.9	2	4.000 [5] - 1994:20.	2057·21 2112·8	1934.0, 1947.10 66 (4) 2020-25
2002 [1] - 1920.12 2007 [4] 1026:2	3	1994:25, 2061:18,	5 300 [1] - 2073·14	66 [1] - 2039.25 67 (1) 1077:17
2097 [1] - 1920.3	3 [26] - 1951:12,	2072:21. 2073:6	5,300 [1] - 2013.14	0 <i>I</i> [3] - 19/7.17, 1077:20 1079:12
21,508 [1] - 21 10:22	1972:20, 1972:21,	4.200 [1] - 2073:13	50 [1] - 2111.0	1977.20, 1970.13
2107 [2] - 1926:4	1972:25, 1973:7,	4.256 [1] - 1969:7	1032.5 1032.7	00 [3] - 2002.13,
2108 [1] - 1920:10	1973:15, 1974:8,	4.313 [1] - 1966:20	1932.3, 1932.7,	2009.7, 2009.0
2115 [1] - 1920:13	1974:21, 1976:9,	4.500 [1] - 2112:17	1932.10, 1933.22,	69 [1] - 2142.22
2127 [2] - 1920:15,	1977:21, 1977:24,	4.1.1 [1] - 2036:7	1969:11 1969:15	6(11 [1] - 2149.11
1920:10 2420 m 1000:4	1978:1, 1978:6,	40 [6] - 1967:21.	1969.22 1969.24	7
2129 [1] - 1920.4	1978:15, 1979:8,	1968:5. 1968:9.	2071:1.2117:6	1
2135 [1] - 1920:9	1979:13, 1980:5,	1968:12, 1968:15,	2139:23	7 [16] - 1948:5,
2 143 [2] - 1920.15,	2082:14, 2110:7,	1968:19	5000 [3] - 1964:20.	2016:24, 2017:18,
1920.10 22 (4) 2002:15	2110:20, 2111:5,	40.6 [2] - 2031:15,	1965:7. 1965:13	2018:2, 2018:17,
22 [4] - 2003.15, 2002:19, 2002:10	2113:17, 2113:25,	2033:1	52-53.XLSX [1] -	2025:11, 2074:4,
2003.10, 2003.19,	2120:12, 2146:2,	40.8 [1] - 2033:2	2056:7	2074:9, 2075:10,
2000.0	2146:3	41 [6] - 2030:6,	526 [2] - 2145:22,	2075:11, 2075:13,
23 [4] - 1943·14	3,000 [1] - 2017:10	2030:12, 2030:13,	2146:12	2075:19, 2076:2,
1972.19 1977.24	3,400 [1] - 2072:19	2030:18, 2031:4,	529 [3] - 2145:23,	2111:11, 2111:14,
1997:4	3,500 [3] - 1994:20,	2031:11	2146:14, 2147:2	2111:20
231 [1] - 1938:1	1994:25, 2061:18	42 [1] - 2142:21	53 [1] - 1937:12	7,000 [3] - 2077:10,
232 [4] - 2017:19.	3,867 [2] - 2017:14,	43 [1] - 1980:1	537 [1] - 1925:12	2111:6, 2113:6
2017:21, 2018:2,	2017.10 2 000 m - 2072:21	433 [1] - 1942:12	54 [4] - 2115:8,	7-day [5] - 2076:21,
2018:17	3,500 [1] - 2072.21	440 [1] - 2140:5	2115:10, 2115:13,	2076:25, 2077:9,
238 [1] - 2027:7	3-1 [5] - 2090.0, 2000.0, 2000.10	447 [1] - 1955:1	2115:22	2079:1, 2079:14
24 [3] - 2000:16,	2090.9, 2090.10, 2000.20	45 [2] - 1974:19,	55 [4] - 2117:11,	72 [1] - 2027.9
2000:17, 2138:13	3-6 [2] - 2091.4	2119:18	2117:14, 2140:21,	755 [1] - 1945.15 75 m 2120.5
24.3 [1] - 2002:1	2091:5	4500 [2] - 1964:24,	2140:23	2120:10
241 [1] - 2054:13	30 [9] - 1974:22.	1965:2	56 [2] - 2097:18,	2120.10
248 [2] - 2021:22,	1982:21, 1998:24,	46 [2] - 2100:12,	2097:21	8
2021:25	2010:2, 2110:23,	2101:5	5th [1] - 2010:11	0
25 [3] - 2004:1,	2133:3, 2133:5,	400 [2] - 2117.12, 2117:17	C	8 [14] - 1941:21,
2004:6, 2138:13	2133:6, 2133:7	2117.17 47 m 1052:25	0	1975:5, 1975:22,
25.7 [2] - 2000:24,	30-year [1] - 2050:24	47 [2] - 1952.25, 1082·18	6 [7] - 1947:22,	1976:13, 1976:24,
2001:5	301 [1] - 1997:13	48 [3] - 1953·1	1971:1, 2016:24,	1978:9, 2063:6,
259 [1] - 2045:16	31 [3] - 2002:20,	1955.10 1955.13	2017:18, 2018:2,	2072:4, 2073:10,
26 [4] - 2004:5,	2002:24, 2133:7	49 [1] - 1969:2	2018:17, 2135:20	2075:12, 2075:23,
2055:14, 2056:7,	316 [1] - 1997:17	495 [1] - 1959:1	6,000 [16] - 1971:24,	2100:12, 2101:1,
2119.17 26 0 (4) 2001:10	32,378 [3] - 2116:6,		1972:3, 1972:22,	2132.4 8 000 (4) 2114.16
26.5 [1] - 2001.19 261 [1] - 1007.7	2116:17, 2116:25	5	1973:16, 1974:11,	80's [1] - 2056:18
201 [1] - 1997.7 27 [3] - 1968:8	326 [1] - 2013:2		1975:2, 1977:16,	81 [1] - 1934-15
1996.24 1996.25	328 [1] - 1997:13	5 [27] - 1958:11,	1977:18, 1978:2,	8:56 [1] - 1925:14
270 [5] - 1997:18.	329 [1] - 1997:17	1965:18, 1999:15,	1980.2, 2048.10,	
2017:19, 2017:21.	330 [1] - 1997:7	1999:17, 1999:19,	2046.14, 2046.19, 2056:21, 2056:23	9
2018:3, 2018:17	343 [1] - 1997:13 340 (4) - 1007:7	2000.2, 2000.3,	2050.21, 2050.25, 2057.21	•
28 [7] - 1947:12,	349 [1] - 1997.7 26 m 2029:12	2000.10, 2000.22, 2001.14	60 [14] - 2027:19	9 [9] - 1976:20,
1966:15, 1999:16,	2028·25	2001:22. 2002:4	2027:23. 2030:19.	1976:24, 1977:9,
2017:5, 2017:6,	37 [5] - 1955-21	2002:24, 2002:25.	2030:22, 2031:1,	1978:12, 2054:11,
2031:21	1957:25 1960.10	2003:11, 2003:20,	2031:7, 2031:12,	2004.10, 2149.17 9 000 (4) - 2140.40
282 [1] - 1997:13	2036:4. 2131:18	2003:25, 2004:10,	2032:1, 2032:12,	90's [1] - 2140.19
289 [1] - 1997:17	. ,			•••••[1]= Z100.10
	37-year [1] - 1958:12	2004:23, 2005:10,	2032:18, 2033:10,	93 [2] - 1934·21
29 [8] - 1955:12,	37-year [1] - 1958:12 39.9 [1] - 2000:6	2004:23, 2005:10, 2005:19, 2006:1,	2032:18, 2033:10, 2037:1, 2139:24,	93 [2] - 1934:21, 2013:4
29 [8] - 1955:12, 1997:6, 2002:13,	37-year [1] - 1958:12 39.9 [1] - 2000:6 3:35 [1] - 2148:22	2004:23, 2005:10, 2005:19, 2006:1,	2032:18, 2033:10, 2037:1, 2139:24, ROUP ^{:13}	93 [2] - 1934:21, 2013:4 95 [1] - 1958:17

Mason & Lockhart.

9:00 [1] - 2148:24	accurate [2] - 2035:12, 2129:16	adapting [1] - 2003:12 add [4] - 1931:21,	2107:19, 2107:22, 2129:22, 2129:23,	2111:17, 2115:4, 2115:6, 2115:9,
Α	accurately [1] -	1931:24, 1983:13	2147:15	2115:11, 2120:2,
A-4 [1] - 2115:14	1940:5	add-back [1] -	Ag [7] - 1931:24,	2120:3, 2120:6,
A.4 [5] - 2009:8,	ACF [49] - 1932.10,	1931.21 addad.ss. 4004.40	1955.1, 1906.0,	2120.0, 2120.20,
2009:11. 2009:12.	1944.15, 1945.13,	added [2] - 1991:12,	1900.9, 1900.17,	2127.1, 2127.4,
2009:19, 2010:16	1946:13, 1946:17,	2071:22	1909.15, 2159.5	2127.7, 2140.17, 2146:22, 2147:1
A.5 [1] - 2009:10	1946:21, 1947:20,	addition [1] - 2015:11	agencies [3] - 2081:1,	2140.23, 2147.1, 2147:7
A.7 [2] - 2075:25	1948:11, 1969:14,	additional [15] -	2083:3, 2083:7	214/./
2076:2	1970:8, 1972:4,	1932:20, 1932:24,	agency [1] - 2080:17	Allen [2] - 2107.20,
a.m [5] - 1925:14	1973:22, 1986:9,	1933:8, 1933:24,	ago [5] - 1997.16,	2104.22
1985.25 1986.2	1993:14, 1995:5,	1934:7, 1934:15,	2013:15, 2033:18,	allocation [1] - 2085:9
2042.7 2148.24	1995:10, 1996:8,	1934:21, 1935:2,	2055:13, 2131:10	Allon [11] - 1928:23,
ability 131 - 1947:3	1996:20, 2007:4,	1949:7, 1950:4,	agree [12] - 1962:25,	1929:13, 2042:20,
1950.3 2134.4	2007:8, 2024:10,	2032:7, 2038:10,	1977:16, 1978:12,	2045:21, 2054:1,
able 171 - 2044-25	2029:10, 2031:16,	2038:12, 2038:14,	2000:12, 2008:18,	2055:2, 2060:22,
2053·1 2120·19	2031:17, 2035:25,	2049:19	2030:16, 2039:7,	2076:6, 2093:18,
2121.18 2134.0	2000:14, 20/1:20,	address [1] - 2030:2	2069:6, 2112:2,	2095:15, 2096:14
2121.10, 210 4 .9, 21/1.13, 21//.11	2085:8, 2085:10,	addressed [1] -	2116:8, 2116:15,	ALLON [63] - 1925:21,
2141.10, 2144.11	2096:16, 2111:22,	2031:23	2119:13	1927:4, 1928:18,
1025.10	2112:16, 2114:22,	adjourned [1] -	agreed [2] - 1998:17,	1928:20, 1929:6,
abovo namod 141	2117:13, 2117:19,	2148:23	2083:10	1929:11, 1931:12,
	2117:22, 2119:2,	adjust [2] - 1947:4,	agrees [2] - 1951:23,	1931:14, 1933:17,
2143.3	2119:11, 2121:9,	1947:8	1952:1	1933:19, 1942:23,
2040-24	2122:2, 2123:18,	adjusted [1] - 1947:6	agricultural [25] -	1943:1, 1943:17,
2049.24	2123:19, 2123:22,	adjustment [1] -	1932:5, 1932:8,	1945:18, 1946:4,
	2123:25, 2135:21,	2016:21	1933:22, 1968:12,	1947:11, 1947:14,
2121.22, 2121.24	2136:24, 2138:10,	Administration [1] -	1968:19, 1969:11,	1951:11, 1951:13,
1062:25 1062:2	2140:4, 2142:3	2059:21	1969:23, 2016:23,	1955:2, 1955:5,
1902.20, 1903.2, 2009:7, 2025:7	acknowledged [1] -	adopt [4] - 1928:14,	2017:14, 2022:18,	1956:14, 1956:16,
2008.7, 2025.7,	1957:5	1928:16, 2027:4,	2055:6, 2059:14,	1959:2, 1959:6,
2000.7, 2000.14,	acre [3] - 2113:12,	2107:8	2114:24, 2118:8,	1968:3, 1975:4,
2000.3, 2090.19, 2006:11	2113:14, 2113:17	adopted [6] - 2013:12,	2118:15, 2121:8,	1975:9, 1975:14,
abeurdity 141	acre-reet [3] -	2022:15, 2029:16,	2122:1, 2129:24,	1975.21, 1976.0, 1076:25, 1077:2
1087:25	2113:12, 2113:14,	2090:11, 2090:14,	2131:19, 2131:23,	1970.20, 1977.0, 1077:0, 1095:11
accented 121 -	2113:17 Acrosso (n. 20145:15	2090:15	2135:7, 2136:21,	1977.0, 1903.11,
2014.14 2050.23	Acreage [1] - 2115.15	adopting [1] - 2015:11	2137:18, 2139:7,	1905.19, 1905.24, 1096:5, 1096:6
accident 111 - 2137.22	acreage [3] - 2114:21,	advantage [1] -		1900.3, 1900.0, 1000.22, 1000.25
accompanied [1] -	2110.9, 2131.3	2139:7	agriculture [10] -	2000:1 2004:4
1965·21	acreages [1] - 2110.2	aerial [5] - 2019:25,	2047.3, 2047.4,	2000.1, 2004.4, 2004.8, 2013.3
accomplish 141 -	acres [4] - 21 10.3,	2020:22, 2021:11,	2119.10, 2133.13, 2127:0, 2129:17	2013.6 2013.10
2076·17	2110:23, 2117:3,	2021:12, 2141:10	2137.9, 2130.17, 2138:20, 2142:10	2013:24 2027:8
accordance 141 -	2 143.13	affect [2] - 2104:24,	2130.20, 2142.10,	2027.11 2039.24
1946·22	2131.11 2121.1 <i>/</i>	2104:25	ahead (5) - 2040-18	2040:2. 2040:6.
according 191 -	2131.11, 2131.14	affected [8] - 1991:20,	2040.21 2040.25	2045:2, 2045:7,
1947:6 1947.7	2131·17	1992:15, 1992:23,	2070.21, 2070.23, 2041.1 2004.18	2045:13, 2045:22.
2000:23 2001:11	ACT (4) 2085-8	1993:5, 1993:7,	al 131 - 2003.2	2052:17. 2091:14.
2001:18, 2001:25	action (1) - 2000.0	1993:10, 2120:15	2036-13 2036-19	2096:25, 2097:2,
2054:18, 2087:10.	21/10·0	affecting [2] - 1950:5,	Δlahama [6] - 2083.7	2099:7, 2105:11
2116:8	2173.3	2103:13	2135.17 2136.16	Allon's [2] - 2063:23,
account [9] - 1949:23.	1953.17 1061.7	AFSIKS [8] - 2118:12,	2140:18, 2141:22	2076:1
2049:22, 2063:18.	1961.12 1963.12	2110:17, 2131:9,	2142:8	allow [3] - 2038:21,
2063:19, 2070:14,	2027.20 2119.5	213111, 2131113, 2122:1-2125:6	Alec's [1] - 2148:14	2038:22, 2039:8
2071:21, 2071:22,	2119:16 2129:6	∠132.1, ∠133.0, 2126:12	Allan [3] - 2086·12	allowable [1] - 2138:2
2094:14, 2105:3	2133:12, 2135:14	2130.12	2087:19. 2088.7	allowed [1] - 2094:21
accounting [3] -	2137:25. 2142:20	2042-10 2042-42	ALLEN [24] - 2107:13	allows [4] - 1961:6,
2070:13, 2071:20,	2145:9	2042.10, 2042.13, 2105.20 2105.25	2107:17. 2108:8.	1961:8, 2122:8,
2071:25	actuality [1] - 1978:5	2103.20, 2103.23, 2106.2	2108:10, 2108:13.	2122:15
accuracy [1] - 1950:18	adapted 111 - 2003 TT	E REPORTING CI	ROUP:15, 2111:15.	almost [5] - 1974:14,
	IIII			

Mason & Lockhart

2069:8, 2072:21,	2137:13	applicant's [1] -	2065:15, 2136:21	2084:4, 2090:8,
2138:24, 2142:10	anomalous [1] -	2133:10	arithmetic [1] -	2090:21, 2095:10
altered [1] - 2002:9	2137:24	applicants [1] -	2137:20	attributable [1] -
altering [1] - 2003:8	anomaly [1] - 2137:14	2130:25	Army [23] - 1930:4,	2006:24
alternative [1] -	answer [13] - 1947:16,	application [1] -	1930:7, 1930:12,	attribute [7] - 1980:24,
2114:2	1968:17, 1992:16,	2130:9	1930:15, 1930:19,	1993:18, 1993:24,
amazingly [1] -	2013:8, 2015:3,	applies [2] - 2126:14,	1944:12, 1944:18,	1995:14, 2012:21,
2069:10	2018:13, 2022:6,	2126:20	1945:20, 1946:11,	2012:22, 2065:2
amount [10] - 1930:24,	2024:17, 2028:25,	apply [5] - 1978:20,	1950:15, 1963:13,	audit [3] - 2137:6,
1995:20, 1996:3,	2029:6, 2040:4,	1978:22, 2068:6,	1964:9, 1983:15,	2137:12, 2137:14
2029:1, 2072:22,	2120:17, 2120:21	2085:7, 2126:17	1988:16, 1988:18,	augment [2] -
2084:15, 2112:15,	answered [1] -	apportioned [1] -	1988:20, 1988:23,	2039:18, 2109:7
2133:16, 2134:23,	2025:16	2049:10	2038:20, 2039:2,	augmenting [1] -
2134:25	answers [4] - 1943:19,	appreciate [4] -	2039:12, 2039:14,	2114:9
amounts [1] - 2019:18	1955:7, 1959:8,	2053:2, 2119:8,	2039:18, 2095:16	August [2] - 1940:1,
analogy [1] - 2010:5	2027:13	2119:23, 2121:21	art [1] - 2029:5	2111:7
analyses [1] - 2066:4	anticipate [5] -	approach [15] -	article [7] - 2002:21,	author [1] - 2062:23
analysis [69] -	2050:1, 2053:19,	1927:7, 1928:7,	2003:12, 2003:14,	authority [3] - 2123:6,
1929:19, 1929:21,	2061:15, 2099:17,	2052:13, 2055:16,	2004:13, 2004:19,	2144:21, 2144:22
1933:14, 1936:10,	2147:25	2079:21, 2082:18,	2005:16	authorized [1] -
1937:3, 1938:4,	anyway [1] - 2048:13	2090:6, 2095:12,	articulated [1] -	1946:22
1950:20, 1950:22,	Apalachicola [43] -	2107:2, 2108:8,	2031:4	authors [4] - 2005:7,
1950:25, 1951:3,	1970:15, 1970:21,	2111:15, 2115:4,	ascribe [1] - 2066:9	2005:16, 2059:20,
1951:6, 1951:14,	1981:3, 1981:6,	2120:2, 2126:25,	ascribed [1] - 2073:21	2084:6
1955:16, 1955:18,	1981:16, 1981:21,	2135:22	aspect [1] - 2146:18	autumn [1] - 2102:1
1958:18, 1959:16,	1981:24, 1988:7,	appropriate [12] -	aspiration [1] -	available [10] -
1960:11, 1960:20,	1988:10, 1988:25,	1962:2, 1963:7,	2104:23	2021:12, 2021:13,
1961:2, 1970:7,	2005:2, 2005:14,	1963:20, 2023:24,	ASR [1] - 2114:16	2021:15, 2030:1.
1971:7, 1971:13,	2005:20, 2005:22,	2084:11, 2130:15,	assembled [1] -	2034:23, 2035:2.
1971:25, 1972:21,	2038:12, 2038:15,	2130:18, 2131:6,	2088:20	2035:23, 2065:8,
1973:7, 1974:12,	2042:25, 2044:1,	2133:14, 2133:16,	assess [7] - 1929:15.	2082:11, 2144:7
1974:14, 1981:19,	2045:17, 2046:15,	2136:14	1950:18, 1951:21.	avenue [2] - 2069.9
1982:3, 1982:6,	2047:2, 2047:9,	appropriation [4] -	1951:23, 1954:20,	2144.6
1983:2, 1987:21,	2049:12, 2057:3,	2049:21, 2049:24,	2018:5, 2094:22	average [28] - 1940:2
1990:8, 1990:11,	2058:9, 2077:23,	2064:15, 2082:8	assessed [1] - 2016:5	1941.1 1941.8
1990:13, 1990:14,	2086:10, 2087:1,	approval [1] - 2058:6	assigned [1] -	1942:2, 1942:4
1991:22, 1992:5,	2102:2, 2109:7,	aptly [1] - 2143:5	1948:21	1942:10, 1982:14.
1992:16, 1993:10,	2109:25, 2118:5,	aquatic [3] - 2081:7.	assistant [1] - 2053-2	1982:19, 1997:23
1993:15, 1995:22,	2121:13, 2125:15,	2085:24, 2085:25	associated [4] -	2012:13, 2027:16
1996:19, 1996:23,	2126:9, 2126:21,	Aquifer [3] - 2117:23.	1938.21 1938.25	2048:9 2048:13
1998:7, 1998:18,	2134:18, 2134:21,	2139:14 2139:15	2000:13 2099:19	2048:18, 2049:1
2007:4, 2018:10,	2136:15, 2142:16,	aguifer 111 - 2130:22	assume [2] - 2018:25	2051:14, 2057:8
2019:10, 2025:21,	2143:19, 2144:13,	aquifers [1] - 2029.9	2034.11	2057:10, 2072:20,
2027:24, 2028:7,	2144:17	area [20] - 2019:22	assuming [1] -	2074:21, 2074:25,
2032:7, 2039:4,	Apalachicola-	2019.24 2020.4	2021.12	2075:4. 2075:6.
2039:16, 2039:21,	Chattahoochee-	2020:7. 2020:11	assure [1] - 2062.2	2075:14, 2075:15,
2042:21, 2054:9,	Flint [1] - 2042:25	2020:18, 2020:21	atmosphere [2] -	2075:20, 2076:23,
2059:3, 2091:18,	apart [1] - 2121:22	2021:5 2047:2	2049·20 2059·2	2092:12
2094:25, 2118:25,	apologize [2] -	2047:3, 2053:17	Atmospheric [1] -	averaged [1] -
2119:9, 2119:15,	2048:21, 2131:10	2053:18, 2124:14	2050·21	2047:25
2119:20, 2120:14,	appear [1] - 2070:22	2130.18 2134.5	attachmont	averages [1] - 2057:6
2120:17, 2130:14	APPEARANCES [1] -	2134:24, 2136:15	1057:1/ 21/5·2/	avoid [2] - 2078:5
analyze [5] - 1936:13,	1925:16	2137:9. 2142:16	2146:3 2146:15	2134:7
1963:18, 1963:21,	appeared [2] -	2143:11	attachmonte rol	aware [24] - 1933:13
1965:22, 2139:1	2045:25 2128.7	areas [4] - 2041-18		1936 2 1949 9
ANDREW [1] -	appendix [4] -	2137:11. 2143:3	attention (40)	1965.11 1992.1
1925:22	1947:23. 1947:24	2143:6	2050:15 2055:12	2031:13, 2031:20
annual [2] - 1997:23,	1948:6. 2076:2	argues [1] - 2065-13	2000.10, 2000.12, 2060.20, 2067.14	2032:5. 2032.24
2031:16	applicant [1] -	arguing 111 - 2005-15	2000.20, 2007.11,	2033:4 2033:7
anomalies [1] -	2130:19 ጥ미፣		ROITP 16 2002.11	2033:8. 2034:23
		- NELOKITNG G	10, 2003.14,	2000.0, 2007.20,
	Т	Lagan (Tagliba		1

61 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart -

2035:5, 2065:12,	based [23] - 1930:3,	2031:17, 2035:25,	1983:23, 1984:14,	2048:7, 2050:7,
2109:14, 2112:20,	1933:5, 1936:7,	2043:1, 2044:16,	1996:16, 2046:20,	2050:22, 2064:24
2112:25, 2113:3,	1955:18, 1957:22,	2046:25, 2050:21,	2053:14, 2054:25,	binder [9] - 1937:10,
2113:4, 2113:5,	1957:25, 1972:25,	2058:9, 2066:14,	2056:19, 2056:23,	1945:24, 1972:17,
2113:20, 2115:18,	1977:14, 1979:25,	2085:8, 2096:16,	2079:6, 2089:3,	1972:19, 1975:10,
2148:8	2006:9, 2019:7,	2111:22, 2112:16,	2089:4, 2089:8,	1991:10, 2021:19,
axis [4] - 2009:23,	2019:21, 2029:20,	2114:22, 2119:2,	2141:24	2076:1, 2101:9
2010:6, 2010:9,	2033:21, 2035:12,	2119:11, 2121:9,	Ben [1] - 2145:14	binders [6] - 1929:6,
2077:7	2036:18, 2087:13,	2122:2, 2123:18,	bench [1] - 2090:6	1939:10, 1945:23,
	2101:22, 2103:20,	2123:19, 2123:22,	beneficial [2] -	2028:11, 2036:3,
B	2114:13, 2119:3,	2123:25, 2136:24,	2132:20, 2132:25	2098:12
8	2125:1. 2139:18	2138:10, 2140:4.	benefit (2) - 1932-19	Biological [1] - 2083.6
back-calculation [1] -	basic [2] - 2042.24	2142.4 2143.19	2038.8	biologist [1] - 2084:14
2072:1	2043.2	basins [5] - 1967.22		bit rol = 2005:15
back-to-back [3] -	basin (60) 1071:14	1968.6 1968.13	1025:10	$2012 \cdot 10 - 2042 \cdot 15$
1994:6, 2061:3,	1074:19 1006:1	2041:10, 2060:1	1925.19 Reminent an 0050-10	2013.19, 2042.15,
2061:11	1974.18, 1990.1,	2041.10, 2009.1	Berrigan [1] - 2052:10	2072:16, 2142:3,
backup [8] - 2000:21.	1996.2, 1996.6,	Dasis [11] - 1953.10,	best [11] - 1942:21,	2143:7, 2146:5,
2000.23 2001.2	1996:7, 1996:13,	1954:22, 1993:13,	1964:8, 2030:1,	2147:4
2001:3, 2001:6	1996:19, 1997:1,	1997:23, 2012:6,	2035:23, 2063:21,	blatantly [1] - 2129:10
2001:11 2001:18	1997:6, 1997:10,	2014:6, 2022:9,	2094:3, 2110:17,	blocks [1] - 2093:9
2001.11, 2001.10,	1997:12, 1997:17,	2063:18, 2074:24,	2139:7, 2144:25,	blows [1] - 2005:19
2001.20	1998:8, 1998:17,	2075:9, 2135:16	2145:6, 2145:10	blue [8] - 1983:2,
Jackwater [2] -	1998:19, 1999:8,	bay [1] - 2142:17	best-management [2]	1983:14, 1984:2,
1991:20, 1992:24	1999:13, 1999:17,	bear [2] - 2099:12,	- 2139:7, 2145:6	1984:8, 1984:13,
bad [1] - 2085:3	1999:19, 1999:20,	2099:23	better [10] - 1950:14.	2009:16. 2056:21.
Bainbridge [30] -	2000:3, 2000:5,	beautiful [1] - 2087:25	1953:17, 1954:4.	2077:17
1971:4, 1980:8,	2000:9, 2000:12,	became [1] - 2129:9	1954:16, 1956:21	Board [1] - 2125.4
1980:9, 1980:12,	2000:24, 2001:5,	become [1] - 2035:2	1959.17 2015.7	board [19] - 2047:5
1980:16, 1980:23,	2001:12, 2001:19.	becomes [2] - 1996.4	2078:25 2100:2	20/7:13 20/7:14
1981:8, 1981:15,	2002:1. 2004:15.	2143.7	2131.17	2047:15, 2047:14,
1981:20, 1981:23,	2004:19 2041:18	becoming (4)	botwoon (47) 1078:7	2047.13, 2048.0,
1982:6, 1982:8,	2041:20, 2046:6	2002:17	1097:7 1097:19	2040.7, 2000.7,
1982:23, 1983:6,	2046.9 2046.11	2002.17 Redient 51 2055:14	1907.7, 1907.10,	2050.14, 2050.16,
1983:10, 1983:23,	2046.12 2049.8	Bediefit [5] - 2055.14,	1993.25, 1994.20,	2050:17, 2050:18,
1984:3, 1984:14,	2053:19 2053:25	2050.7, 2050.25,	1995:1, 1995:15,	2050:19, 2050:21,
1984:21, 1985:8,	2000:19, 2000:20,	2057:12, 2065:12	1995:24, 1999:6,	2051:11, 2092:20,
2044:16. 2045:15.	2000.2, 207 1.0,	bedrock [2] - 2068:13,	2006:21, 2009:1,	2092:22, 2092:25,
2046:21, 2046:22,	2073.2, 2118.3,	2106:7	2009:20, 2010:23,	2093:1, 2125:3
2050:15, 2050:20	2118.8, 2118.22,	began [2] - 1972:9,	2011:10, 2011:16,	boards [5] - 2041:23,
2050.25, 2051.13	2119.4, 2119.17,	2125:7	2011:19, 2012:3,	2042:1, 2042:17,
2000.20, 2001.10,	2134:12, 2134:15,	begin [1] - 1976:17	2012:18, 2012:23,	2045:11, 2045:24
balance (42) 1000:5	2134:24, 2137:1,	beginning [3] -	2028:21, 2035:24,	bodies [1] - 2124:18
2050:6 2070:6	2137:8, 2138:22,	1984:11, 2016:3,	2062:25, 2064:2,	body [1] - 2018:21
2003.0, 2070.0,	2138:24, 2139:14,	2101:8	2066:6, 2066:10,	book [2] - 2025:6,
2070.0, 2070.9,	2139:22, 2140:14,	begins [2] - 2095:22,	2070:1, 2075:11,	2045:16
2070.12, 2070.17,	2141:16, 2142:11,	2128:16	2076:11, 2077:5,	books [1] - 2048:3
2070.20, 2070.24,	2142:12, 2143:1,	behind [5] - 1946:2,	2077:12, 2085:17,	boots [1] - 2054:20
2071:0, 2076:11,	2143:4, 2143:9,	1947:22, 1948:5.	2089:17, 2097:11,	border [3] - 2141:21.
2105:2	2143:12, 2144:4	1975:15, 2139:19	2098:2, 2103:7,	2142:8. 2142:9
Dalanced [1] -	Basin [51] - 1932:6,	belabor [2] - 2083:15.	2114:16, 2116:10,	bottom [14] - 1931-20
1948:16	1932:12, 1932:16,	2084.1	2116:12, 2117:3,	1942.1 1952.25
balancing [1] -	1935:11, 1944:16,	belief [1] - 1954-15	2117:5, 2117:6,	1953:4 1977:1
1948:23	1946:13, 1946:21,	helow [201 - 1065-2	2117:7, 2135:17,	1007.22 2004.6
Balmoral [1] - 2115:19	1969:14, 1969:23,	1065.0 1065.12	2136:20, 2141:22,	2085.13 2085.14
bank [1] - 2070:14	1970:9, 1972:4,	1066.16 1060.3	2143:15, 2144:1	2003.13, 2003.14,
Bankruptcy [2] -	1973:22, 1986:9,	1072.2 1072.22	bevond [2] - 1991:9.	2037.24, 2110.10,
1925:12, 2148:10	1993:14, 1995:6,	1912.2, 1912.22,	2138:14	2110.9, 2120.2U, 0100.01
Bar [3] - 2110:5,	1995:10, 1996:8,	1973.10, 1974:10,	bias (3) - 1952.9	2120.21 heuroeuu 0070:0
2110:7, 2110:10	1996:21, 2002:10.	19/5:2, 19/7:18,	1952.10 1952.3,	bounce [1] - 20/0:2
bars [2] - 1973:19,	2003:1, 2004:25.	1978:2, 1980:2,	hia 171 - 20/17·12	bound [2] - 1932:8,
2077:17	2007:5. 2007:9.	1980:16, 1982:9,	15 2041.13,	1935:13
base [1] - 2019:18	2024:10. 2029:1 THI	E REPORTING G	KUUP 113, 2040.0,	box [1] - 2094:14
	, , , M	lason & Lockha	rt	

boxed [1] - 2087:4	2127:7, 2129:21,	2067:14, 2076:4,	category [1] - 2057:22	1978:2, 1980:2,
bracketed [1] -	2135:24, 2141:1	2076:9, 2076:12,	causal [1] - 2102:17	1980:16, 1982:9,
2113:25	•	2078:20, 2078:21,	caused [8] - 1938:9,	1983:7, 1983:11,
break [9] - 1985:13,	C	2078:25	1938:22, 1940:10,	1983:12, 1983:23,
1985:23, 1986:7,	calculate [5] - 2024:6.	cannot [2] - 1947:18,	1974:18, 1993:20,	1984:14, 1994:20,
2040:16, 2040:20,	2030:6. 2058:16.	1992:25	2003:7, 2006:5,	1995:1, 2010:6,
2040:22, 2042:4,	2067:24, 2094:11	cap [22] - 1931:9,	2067:9	2010:13, 2010:24,
2042:15, 2105:20	calculated [11] -	1932:3, 1932:10,	causes [1] - 2144:16	2011.10, 2011.17,
Brett [3] - 1926:4,	1935:6, 1935:14,	1932:14, 1932:25,	causing [2] - 1972:11,	2017.10, 2017.14,
2106:12, 2106:24	1935:23, 1941:25,	1933:9, 1934:4,	2002:14	2017.10, 2017.19, 2017.21
bridge [1] - 2044:7	1962:12, 2007:23,	1934:13, 1934:20,	center [7] - 2139:10,	2017.21, 2010.3,
brief [2] - 2095:19,	2015:23, 2017:9,	1905:10, 1900:1,	2140:2, 2140:3,	2010.7, 2010.0,
2096:25	2026:11, 2065:23,	1900.19, 1900.23,	2140:16, 2141:3,	2010.10, 2022.20, 2022.1, 2022.9
briefly [4] - 2060:23,	2111:23	1907.14, 1907.20,	2141:11, 2141:25	2023.1, 2023.0, 2023.10
2097:17, 2098:10,	calculates [4] -	1900.4, 1900.11,	center-pivot [6] -	2023.10, 2030.10,
2110:15	1941:18, 1942:13,	1909.9, 1909.21,	2139:10, 2140:3,	2030.12, 2040.10,
bring [1] - 2052:19	2069:24, 2095:3	2090.14, 2090.23,	2140:16, 2141:3,	2040.19, 2051.14,
BRITNEY [1] -	calculation [19] -	2130.2 canacity (4) 1045:16	2141:11, 2141:25	2053.14, 2054.11,
1925:21	1947:19, 1961:1,	2025-14 2068-18	center-pivots [1] -	2054.10, 2054.17,
Droad [1] - 2008:14	1961:15, 1961:24,	2023. 14, 2000. 10, 2074·17	2140.2 contain	2061:18 2072:14
Droken [1] - 2137:21	1962:18, 1998:21,	canned (1) - 1066-11	certain [9] - 2019:25,	2072:19, 2072:21
brown [2] - 2101:17,	1999:7, 2018:19,	capped[1] = 1000.11	2031:3, 2046:8,	2073:6. 2073:13
2104:6	2019:5, 2067:16,	1054:3 1065:23	2084:15, 2088:4,	2073:14, 2073:17
bucket [1] - 2063:4	2067:17, 2068:4,	caption 1078.1	2089:4, 2122:9,	2077:10, 2089:24
budget [1] - 2060:8	2068:14, 2070:19,	2002.25	ZIZ7.19	2097:5. 2097:12.
budgeted [1] -	2071:25, 2072:1,	captures (4) 2063.7	Certainly [23] -	2098:1, 2098:18,
2128:10	2073:13, 2087:4,	captures $[1] = 2003.7$	1931:19, 1958:10,	2098:20, 2110:23.
build [2] - 2069:8,	2116:11	capturing [1] - 1999.2	1900.18, 1901.10,	2111:1. 2111:6.
2114:10	calculations [22] -	1008-25 2030-4	1903.20, 1900.10,	2112:9. 2112:17.
building [3] - 2078:1,	1931:2, 1931:5,	1990.23, 2039.4, 2030:16, 2030:20	2011.12, 2014.14, 2027.4, 2021.10	2112:22, 2113:1,
2078:2, 2078:4	1931:10, 1934:1,	2059.10, 2059.20, 2058.5	2027.4, 2031.10,	2113:6
built [2] - 1995:7,	1944:20, 1945:1,		2050.13, 2040.10, 2050.11, 2056.18	cfs's [1] - 2111:7
2085:1	1949:24, 1950:6,	2142·16	2066:5 2073:23	chair [1] - 1927:15
DUIK [1] - 2014:18	1987:11, 1990:12,	carry 11 - 2056.4	2085:10 2085:22	chance [1] - 2109:21
Dullets [1] - 2110:19	2014:9, 2014:13,	case [37] - 1020:14	2096.8 2105.21	change [28] - 1974:18,
Dureau [1] - 2137:6	2014:16, 2015:10,	1943.3 1944.5	2122:24 2133:21	2012:14, 2029:2,
BY [51] - 1928:12,	2015:15, 2015:21,	1952:23 2023:23	2138:11	2038:20, 2039:8,
1929:11, 1931:14,	2016:8, 2019:13,	2024:4, 2024:19.	CERTIFICATE [1] -	2050:2, 2050:10,
1933.19, 1943.1, 1042:17, 1046:4	2060:12, 2066:25,	2025:22, 2026:2,	2149:1	2053:20, 2061:23,
1943.17, 1940.4, 1047:14 1051:13	2068:15, 2113:11	2028:3, 2034:18,	certify [2] - 2149:3,	2061:24, 2066:2,
1947.14, 1951.15,	calculator [1] -	2046:5, 2046:23,	2149:7	2066:21, 2067:21,
1959:6, 1968:3	2017:18	2049:11, 2058:22,	cfs [98] - 1933:23,	2067:22, 2067:24,
1975:21 1976:6	calendar [3] -	2065:5, 2065:20,	1934:6, 1935:2,	2069:17, 2069:19,
1977.8 1986.6	1970.24, 1979.10,	2066:20, 2067:8,	1938:1, 1941:2,	2069:22, 2070:5,
2000:1. 2004:8.	2009.25 Calhaun (4) 2114:12	2068:8, 2078:7,	1941:7, 1941:13,	2071:17, 2071:18,
2013:6. 2013:24.	calibrate m 2067:5	2080:3, 2084:2,	1941:16, 1942:7,	2078:12, 2088:6,
2027:11, 2040:2,	2060:21	2091:23, 2092:4,	1942:12, 1962:22,	2091:25, 2096:15,
2041:5, 2042:18,	calibrated 171	2095:11, 2107:8,	1963:5, 1964:20,	2096:20
2046:2, 2053:5,		2107:21, 2112:21,	1964:24, 1965:2,	changed [3] -
2056:5, 2079:24,	2007.0, 2000.0, 2008.16	2119:24, 2127:14,	1966:7, 1966:12,	1996:20, 2028:25,
2082:20, 2086:19,	2000.10, 2000.10, 2011:11_2067:11	2133:15, 2134:8,	1966:16, 1966:20,	2033:1
2090:7, 2091:11,	2011:11, 2007:11, 2067:11,	2144:2, 2144:11,	1967:6, 1967:11,	cnanges [14] - 1970:8,
2092:8, 2095:14,	calibration (201 -	2147:20	1967:15, 1967:17,	1970:9, 1970:14,
2097:2, 2107:6,	2007·11 2007·14	cases [3] - 2023:12,	1968:25, 1969:3,	1970:20, 1970:25,
2107:17, 2108:10,	2007.11, 2007.14, 2008:4 2008:12	2085:21, 2130:20	1969:7, 1969:19,	1996:14, 2035:25,
2108:13, 2108:15,	2000.4, 2000.12,	Cat [3] - 2110:4,	1970:4, 1971:24,	2049:23, 2049:25,
2111:17, 2115:6,	2000.17, 2003.2,	2110:6, 2110:10	1972:3, 1972:23,	
2115:11, 2120:3,	2010:20 2011.20	catchment [1] -	1973:16, 1975:2,	2000.9, 2102.17
2120:8, 2127:1,	2011:23, 2067:6 THI	E REPORTING G	ROUP ^{:16,} 1977:18,	changing [1] - 2033:5
	,,,	I Carlan C Taalaha		

chapter [1] - 2091:5 characterize [1] - 2011:1 charge [1] - 2043:20 chart [3] - 2056:12, 2111:18, 2112:10 Chattahoochee [33] - 1971:4, 1971:22, 1971:23, 1972:12, 1972:23, 1973:1, 1976:14, 1977:11, 1976:14, 1977:11, 1978:3, 1979:21, 2009:17, 2015:22, 2042:25, 2043:25, 2044:1, 2046:4, 2046:13, 2046:14, 2046:16, 2046:17, 2046:18, 2047:5, 2047:10, 2047:13, 2050:8, 2057:3, 2073:1, 2073:2, 2087:1, 2141:21 check [3] - 1978:18, 1978:23, 2074:22 checked [1] - 2014:14 checks [1] - 2019:17 chiefly [1] - 2043:5 Chipola [6] - 2005:3,	Claudette [4] - 1925:14, 2149:2, 2149:15, 2149:15 clear [8] - 1985:6, 2012:13, 2055:8, 2096:18, 2125:20, 2126:7, 2131:10, 2144:8 clearly [3] - 2036:9, 2056:22, 2089:20 CLERK [5] - 1927:18, 1927:25, 2040:25, 2106:13, 2106:20 climate [9] - 1994:23, 2058:14, 2058:15, 2059:15, 2059:17, 2062:25, 2065:22, 2066:8, 2082:1 climatic [3] - 2006:10, 2131:4, 2133:17 climatological [1] - 2064:5 clip [8] - 1943:15, 1947:12, 1955:3, 1975:6, 1976:8, 2013:4, 2027:9, 2039:25 clips [1] - 1959:3 close [10] - 1931:24,	1940:16, 1996:25, 2092:14 columns [2] - 1939:25, 1940:4 combining [1] - 2058:18 coming [6] - 2049:9, 2058:11, 2061:22, 2064:6, 2066:24, 2070:16 command [1] - 2025:17 commencing [1] - 1925:13 Commission [1] - 2149:17 commit [2] - 2079:16, 2079:23 committee [1] - 2141:8 common [3] - 2074:24, 2075:9, 2135:19 communities [3] - 2142:7, 2142:13, 2142:14 comparable [2] - 2069:3, 2075:23 compare [7] - 1973:3,	2059:5 comprehensive [6] - 2118:2, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2135:17, 2135:21, 2136:18 computation [2] - 2019:19, 2024:18 computationally [1] - 2066:23 computed [2] - 1966:15, 1969:2 computer [7] - 2024:17, 2042:20, 2042:22, 2056:11, 2068:5, 2071:1, 2071:6 con [1] - 1966:25 concentrating [1] - 2004:24 concept [1] - 2124:3 concerned [3] - 2067:7, 2067:10, 2074:12 concerns [1] - 2079:11 conclude [2] - 1972:10, 2064:25 concluded [3] -	Congress [1] - 1925:12 conjunction [1] - 2139:5 connection [14] - 1947:25, 1952:22, 1989:16, 2025:21, 2085:17, 2085:18, 2085:21, 2085:22, 2085:23, 2086:2, 2086:3, 2086:8, 2086:14, 2086:15 connections [1] - 2086:6 consecutive [13] - 1972:22, 1973:12, 1973:16, 1974:10, 1974:20, 1975:2, 1977:5, 1977:17, 1977:20, 1978:2, 1977:20, 1978:2, 1978:7, 1979:12, 1980:1 Conservator [2] - 2083:8, 2143:16 conservation [7] - 2070:21, 2097:10, 2098:17, 2113:21, 2138:17, 2143:14, 2145:4
Chipola [6] - 2005:3, 2005:6, 2121:13, 2125:15, 2126:9,	close [10] - 1931:24, 1945:17, 1951:25, 1952:6, 1952:14,	compare [7] - 1973:3, 1973:8, 1981:20, 1981:23, 1987:15,	concluded [3] - 2035:22, 2103:12, 2104:20	2145:4 conservative [6] - 1932:8, 2014:25,
2126:21 chose [2] - 1999:11,	1952:17, 2008:25, 2040:14, 2075:3,	2003:25, 2069:22 compared [5] -	conclusion [4] - 1981:7, 2066:4,	2015:4, 2027:20, 2030:19, 2031:5
2104:18	2095:6	1974:6, 2005:18,	2066:12, 2069:2	conserves [1] -
chuckle [1] - 2143:18	closed [1] - 2148:9	2006:17, 2008:21,	conclusions [5] -	2038:11
circle [2] - 1983:22,	closely [2] - 1953:11,	2022:3	2014:9, 2015:16,	consider [2] -
1984:9	2010:18	comparing [1] -	2016:10, 2017:4, 2100:4	1959:25, 1991:23
2063·6	1953.7 1953.8	1994.0 comparison [10] -	2100:4	2072:22
circumstance [2] -	1953:21, 1953:24.	1982:1, 1989:9.	2121:14	consideration [2] -
2133:14, 2145:1	1956:1, 1956:2,	2009:20, 2018:6,	conditions [24] -	2036:11, 2037:6
cite [5] - 2004:13,	1956:24, 1957:3,	2061:5, 2062:3,	1933:1, 1933:4,	considered [9] -
2033:17, 2033:21,	1959:20, 1959:23,	2062:10, 2064:21,	1933:6, 1933:10,	1933:5, 1948:15,
2036:24, 2115:1	1960:6, 1960:8	2089:16, 2103:6	1934:8, 1934:17,	1958:13, 1978:6,
cited [2] - 1953:15,	cloud [1] - 2038:18	compilation [1] -	1934:22, 1935:4,	2037:4, 2091:22,
2136:3 City (47) 1071:5	Coast [1] - 2104:13	2130:20	1938:2, 1941:14, 1041:20, 1047:4	2133.13, 2133.23, 2133·24
1986.12 1986.18			1941.20, 1947.4, 1947:6 1948:15	consisted [1] -
1988:2, 1988:6.	2145:14	1962:8. 1962:12.	1961:15, 1963:14,	2044:10
1990:15, 1990:20,	collect [2] - 1970:17,	2074:19	1992:2, 1992:11,	consistent [4] -
1990:25, 1991:14,	2046:7	complex [2] -	2067:2, 2077:9,	2074:13, 2082:12,
1992:6, 1992:12,	collected [1] -	2070:10, 2085:1	2130:13, 2133:17,	2082:15, 2089:22
2044:19, 2052:2,	1970:13	compliance [5] -	2134:8, 2137:5	consistently [2] -
2052:5, 2052:6,	collectively [1] -	1983:16, 2089:11,	CONDUCTED [1] -	1959:10, 1959:15
Claiborne [1] -	1940.14 collects [2] - 2041·10	2009.10, 2089.20, 2138.6	confidence 111 -	constrained 121 -
2139:14	2046:7	component [4] -	2075:2	2037:14, 2037:20
claims [1] - 2097:10	colored [2] - 2050:13,	2043:1, 2049:18,	confluence [1] -	constrict [1] - 2134:3
clarify [1] - 2146:23	2093:9	2059:9, 2059:11	2141:20	construct [3] -
class [1] - 2070:11	column [4] - 1939: THE	E REPORTING G	ROUP 3ed [1] - 2091:7	2018:22, 2114:15,
	M	lason & Lockha	rt	

Mason & Lockhart

2144:14	2050:6, 2051:8,	1946:11, 1946:17,	2110:10, 2111:2,	2114:22, 2115:15,
constructed [1] -	2059:11, 2062:1,	1946:20, 1947:1,	2113:7, 2115:20,	2115:23, 2116:3,
2036:10	2065:2, 2066:14,	1947:25, 1948:9,	2117:9, 2117:13,	2116:10, 2116:20,
consultant [2] -	2067:1, 2067:19,	1948:14, 1948:19,	2117:19, 2117:24,	2116:22, 2138:24,
2008:1, 2008:8	2071:19, 2072:1,	1948:21, 1949:19,	2117:25, 2118:19,	2142:7, 2143:11
consumer [1] -	2072:11, 2072:13,	1950:15, 1963:4,	2118:22, 2118:23,	county [1] - 2116:19
2138:20	2073:7, 2082:8,	1963:13, 1964:9,	2119:2, 2121:4,	couple [5] - 2011:5,
consumes [1] -	2082:9, 2096:12,	1964:13, 1964:19,	2121:9, 2122:2,	2048:22, 2068:1,
2064:16	2103:13, 2104:21,	1965:6, 1965:8,	2122:10, 2123:1,	2110:19, 2125:18
consumption [29] -	2105:8, 2111:21,	1965:12, 1967:14,	2123:4, 2123:8,	course [23] - 1949:18,
1931:4, 1931:9,	2111:25, 2112:15	1983:16, 1988:16,	2123:9, 2123:13,	1949:22, 1954:7,
1932:3, 1932:10,	contact [3] - 2130:8,	1988:18, 1988:20,	2123:14, 2123:23,	1982:13, 2040:15,
1932:14, 1933:9,	2137:17, 2137:19	2038:20, 2039:2,	2124:1, 2124:2,	2041:14, 2044:14,
1934:4, 1934:13,	contention [1] -	2039:7, 2039:12,	2124:7, 2124:8,	2048:2, 2058:8,
1934:20, 1937:19,	1989:15	2094:1, 2094:3,	2124:14, 2124:15,	2058:23, 2068:9,
1940:11, 1954:3,	context [4] - 2008:9,	2094:7, 2094:15,	2124:20, 2124:23,	2070:1, 2071:19,
1965:16, 1965:23,	2043:10, 2120:23,	2094:23, 2095:1,	2124:24, 2125:2,	2074:11, 2077:21,
1966:1, 1966:19,	2135:12	2095:9, 2095:16,	2125:5, 2125:8,	2101:24, 2103:2,
1966:23, 1967:20,	continually [1] -	2096:4, 2096:7	2125:9, 2125:12,	2103:17, 2104:5,
1968:4, 1968:11,	1948:15	Corps' [1] - 1930:15	2125:13, 2125:15,	2120:1, 2121:6,
1969:9, 1969:21,	continued [1] -	Correct [1] - 2124:19	2125:22, 2126:4,	2134:24, 2138:18
2041:13, 2049:6,	2128:23	correct [139] -	2126:9, 2126:12,	court [1] - 1943:7
2049:7, 2071:15,	continuous [1] -	1929:17, 1929:20,	2126:13, 2126:15,	COURT [1] - 1925:1
2098:13, 2098:23,	2103:18	1929:24, 1930:5,	2126:16, 2126:18,	Court [18] - 1925:12,
2144:18	contract [2] - 2115:19,	1931:1, 1932:6,	2126:22, 2126:23,	1945:22, 1945:25,
consumptive [90] -	2139:22	1932:12, 1932:17,	2127:9, 2127:17,	1963:25, 1975:11,
1929:16, 1930:24,	contrast [1] - 2000:9	1933:11, 1934:9,	2127:20, 2127:23,	1985:14, 1997:16,
1934:14, 1935:18,	control [4] - 1946:12,	1934:23, 1935:5,	2127:24, 2128:2,	1999:12, 2073:16,
1936:12, 1936:14,	1946:17, 1948:16,	1935:12, 1935:22,	2128:6, 2128:11,	2097:5, 2098:25,
1936:20, 1937:3,	1961:11	1935:25, 1936:3,	2129:16, 2149:4	2126:7, 2130:2,
1938:9, 1938:21,	controls [1] - 1988:20	1937:6, 1941:24,	correctly [1] - 2071:4	2132:24, 2136:17,
1939:15, 1940:25,	convenient [1] -	1942:8, 1943:5,	correlation [1] -	2142:3, 2148:10,
1941:6, 1941:23,	1985:13	1943:6, 1943:23,	1987:18	2149:16
1942:5, 1949:4,	conversation [1] -	1943:24, 1944:3,	correspond [1] -	Court's [2] - 1929:7,
1949:5, 1960:17,	2114:14	1946:6, 1948:1,	2049:1	2013:22
1960:23, 1963:8,	conversations [1] -	1950:11, 1955:20,	corresponding [10] -	courtroom [1] -
1963:19, 1963:21,	2027:2	1955:23, 1956:10,	1941:15, 1973:6,	2021:17
1964:5, 1966:2,	conversion [1] -	1956:13, 1958:2,	1983:25, 1984:6,	cover [1] - 2137:11
1966:10, 1967:15,	2023:21	1961:20, 1963:10,	1984:17, 1984:23,	CRAIG [1] - 1925:20
1970:11, 1970:16,	convert [2] - 2023:17	1964:6, 1965:3,	1985:8, 1989:3,	Crawford [2] - 2071:2,
1970:22, 1974:17,	2074:23	1965:15, 1967:7,	2082:4, 2092:16	2071:9
1980:25, 1981:17,	converted [1] -	1967:23, 1969:16,	cost [2] - 2139:8,	create [3] - 1942:18.
1993:19, 1994:1,	2047.23	1969:19, 1974:11,	2145:7	1950:8. 2059:12
1994:14, 1994:16,	convince [1] - 2070-11	1974:23, 1979:9,	cost-share [2] -	created [5] - 1942:19.
1995:2, 1995:16,	coordinated 111 -	1980:6, 1981:10,	2139:8, 2145:7	1943:21, 2033:24.
1996:11, 2000:14,	2083·5	1981:13, 1985:9,	cotton [1] - 2139:20	2111:11, 2144:5
2006:6, 2006:25,	conies (5) - 1975-20	1985:10, 1986:19,	counsel [16] - 1927:3,	creating [1] - 2075:10
2011:21, 2012:4,	2045.8 2045.10	1992:8, 1993:22,	1928:25, 1929:2,	creation [2] - 2129:5
2012:7, 2012:9,	2045:11 2127:5	1993:23, 2006:2,	1956:11, 1967:24,	2129.6
2012:20, 2014:1,	2043.11, 2127.3	2014:18, 2016:19,	1976:21, 2044:23,	Creek [40] - 1967-22
2014:24, 2015:8,	10/5·22 10/6·1	2017:23, 2021:1,	2055:19, 2091:1,	1967 23 1968 6
2015:12, 2015:15,	1945.22, 1940.1,	2022:6, 2022:16,	2105:10, 2106:3,	1968:14 1968:20
2015:20, 2015:25,	2004:5 2052:13	2022:17, 2023:7,	2134:11, 2134:14,	1968.21 1986.12
2016:5, 2016:8,	2004.3, 2032.13, 2108.11 2120.7	2023:12, 2025:24,	2143:22, 2145:20,	1986:19 1986:21
2016:13, 2016:22,	Corner 101 - 1077·1	2026:4, 2029:23,	2148:7	1986:24 1987 5
2016:23, 2017:8,	2004·7	2037:7, 2083:4,	counted [2] - 1978:6,	1987:8 1987:12
2017:9, 2017:14,	2007.1 Corpe 1471 1020-4	2098:9, 2103:21,	2140:17	1987:16 1987.17
2019:5, 2037:19,	1030.7 1020.42	2108:1, 2108:4,	country [2] - 2043:14,	1987:22 1988.6
2037:23, 2038:7,	1930.7, 1930.12, 1030.10, 1044.12	2108:5, 2108:23,	2043:21	1988 12 1989 7
2049:19, 2049:23,	1930.19, 1944.12, 1044-19, 1045-2 中日1		ן ב∩ווס ע [11] - 2114:12.	1989:12, 1990.9
	1944.10, 1949.2 I'HI	- REFORTING G		1000.12, 1000.0,
	M	ason & Lockha	rt	1

65 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

1990:14, 1990:21,	1966:2, 1967:6,	1956:24, 1957:2,	1937:23, 1941:11,	1948:16
1990:25, 1991:2,	1967:15, 2038:7	1958:1, 1958:19,	1941:17, 1942:14,	decline [8] - 1938:10,
1991:4, 1991:15,	cutbacks [1] - 1932:21	1959:16, 1960:3,	1942:16, 1942:20,	1938:22, 1989:1,
1991:23, 1992:12,	cutting [1] - 1935:1	1960:11. 1960:21.	1944:21, 1950:10.	1989:4. 1993:21.
1993:3, 2044:20,	cycle [1] - 2072.16	1970:13, 1970:17,	1950:14, 1951:4,	1996 10 1998 22
2052.7 2053.8	cylinder (1) - 2063:4	1970.19 1970.20	1951.8 1953.11	1999.12
2053.16 2053.18	Cymhaer (1) - 2003.4	1972:25 1976:9	1953 18 1954 2	declined [1] - 1996.7
2053.21 2054.7	2106:12 2106:25	1976:17 1977:17	1954.14 1954.17	doclines m 1071:14
2050.21, 2054.7,	2100.12, 2100.25,	1080.7 1080.0	1956:20 1956:24	2002.9 2002.14
critoria (4) 2000:16	2107.7, 2107.18,	1092:4 1092:24	1057:2 1059:10	2002.0, 2002.14
2080.10, 2080.21	2107:24, 2108:16,	1902.4, 1902.24,	1957.2, 1956.19,	declining [1] -
2080.19, 2080.21,	2129:18, 2129:22,	1900.10, 1907.10,	1959.16, 1960.3,	1971:18
2081:6, 2081:13,	2131:13, 2135:25,	1987:16, 1998:3,	1960:21	decrease [12] -
2081:15, 2082:17,	2136:22, 2140:2,	1998:4, 1998:13,	dataset [7] - 1959:25,	1938:25, 1939:3,
2083:11, 2087:5,	2140:15, 2141:2,	1998:18, 1998:22,	2059:17, 2059:23,	1939:5, 1940:9,
2087:14, 2089:11,	2142:1, 2143:21,	1999:11, 2000:20,	2062:15, 2062:17,	1940:12, 1940:13,
2089:18, 2090:2,	2145:11, 2145:19,	2000:23, 2001:2,	2062:18, 2062:19	1941:15, 1941:24,
2092:3	2147:20	2001:3, 2001:6,	date [4] - 2034:23,	1983:25, 1984:2,
criterion [6] - 2053:13,	cypress [1] - 2087:25	2001:11, 2001:19,	2035:1, 2035:13,	1984:17, 2121:18
2087:12, 2093:3,		2001:25, 2008:22,	2090:12	decreased [8] -
2093:5, 2093:7,	D	2009:2, 2010:18,	dated [3] - 2109:11,	1935:18, 1936:25,
2093:11	-	2012:24, 2014:20,	2146:2, 2146:3	1938:1, 1940:18,
critical [9] - 2050:3,	daily [6] - 1976:14,	2014:22, 2019:18,	day-to-day [2] -	1940:20, 1941:1.
2051:20, 2084:11.	1977:10, 1979:21,	2019:25, 2021:15,	1949:20, 2012:6	1941.21 1964.6
2087:23, 2088:25,	2047:25, 2057:8,	2023:17, 2035:12,	days [43] - 1933:24	decreases m -
2102.14 2103.24	2057:10	2035:13, 2041:16,	1934.6 1934.15	1020.15 1030.23
2102.14, 2100.24,	Dam [19] - 1949:12,	2042:17, 2042:21	1034:22 1035:3	1929.13, 1930.23,
criticism (2)	1953:18, 1962:13,	2042.24 2043.2	1025:7 1042:5	1930.11, 1949.4,
	1962:16, 1962:21,	2048:4 2050:4	1955.7, 1945.5,	1949:5, 1963:14,
1978.20, 1978.22	1964:4. 1964:13.	2050:5, 2051:18	1900.11, 1900.15,	1903.21, 2010.4,
Critters [2] - 2084: 14,	1964.20 1965.1	2050.5, 2051.10,	1907.10, 1909.3,	2016:6
2104:15	1966 6 1966 20	2052.11, 2053.0,	1971:2, 1971:21,	Defendants [1] -
crop [4] - 2131:7,	1967:10 1968:25	2053.0, 2054.10, 2054.10, 2057.2	1971:23, 1972:22,	1925:7
2132:6, 2133:17,	1060:3 1060:20,	2054.19, 2057.2,	1973:12, 1973:16,	deficit [1] - 2020:8
2139:18	1070:3 1088:22	2007.4, 2007.10,	1974:8, 1974:10,	definitely [4] - 1974:7,
CROSS [2] - 1929:10,	1970.3, 1900.22,	2038:2, 2038:5,	1974:20, 1975:2,	2041:20, 2065:1,
2107:16	damage (4) 2079:6	2058:7, 2058:14,	1977:14, 1977:17,	2081:1
cross [9] - 1930:25,		2058:15, 2059:15,	1977:20, 1978:2,	definition [5] -
1945:20, 1975:4,	damaged [1] - 2085.2	2060:1, 2060:3,	1978:7, 1978:13,	1977:15, 1978:13,
1985:20, 2013:11,	data [153] - 1929:23,	2060:4, 2060:7,	1978:14, 1979:11,	1979:12, 1979:25,
2013:18, 2013:20,	1930:1, 1930:2,	2062:9, 2062:14,	1979:12, 1979:24,	1993:1
2016:3, 2042:19	1930:14, 1930:18,	2062:15, 2062:16,	1980:1, 2031:14,	DEIS [4] - 1945:20,
Cross [1] - 1926:2	1930:22, 1931:17,	2062:21, 2062:23,	2044:9, 2054:10,	1946:5, 1947:23,
cross-examination [5]	1934:1, 1934:3,	2062:25, 2065:23,	2054:13, 2056:19,	1947:25
- 1945:20, 1985:20,	1934:10, 1934:12,	2068:10, 2068:12,	2056:22, 2057:6,	delavs [3] - 2128:5.
2013:11, 2013:18,	1934:25, 1935:8,	2069:7, 2069:23,	2057:17, 2057:18,	2128:16, 2128:22
2016:3	1935:16, 1936:8,	2070:2, 2093:16,	2110:23, 2111:2	deliver [1] - 2146.9
CROSS-	1936:12, 1936:24,	2093:25, 2094:14,	debate [1] - 2084:2	deluged (1) - 2101.18
EXAMINATION [2] -	1937:14, 1937:23,	2094:20, 2096:19,	decade [1] - 2145:5	demo [1] = 2056:7
1929.10 2107.16	1940:4, 1941:11,	2103:20, 2103:22,	decades [1] - 2089:18	demonstrable M
CRR [2] - 1925-14	1941:17, 1942:14,	2103:23, 2106:8,	December [3] -	
2140:15	1942:16, 1942:20,	2118:13, 2131:2,	1982.10 1985.3	2099.5
2149.15 aubio (5) 2042:14	1944:21, 1945:4,	2131:3, 2131:8	2149.11	demonstrative [20] -
Cubic [5] - 2043.14,	1947:7, 1947:8,	data-driven [41] -	docont (4) 2130:14	1931:12, 1933:18,
2043.15, 2047.24,	1949:18, 1950:10,	1929:23, 1930:1,	decide rat 2029:20	1951:11, 1956:14,
2054:11, 2119:18	1950:14, 1950:23,	1930:2. 1930:14.	decide [3] - 2038.20,	1965:18, 1971:1,
cumulative [1] -	1951:4. 1951:8.	1930:18, 1930.22	2039:7, 2130:20	1975:5, 1975:22,
2020:10	1951:24, 1952:1	1931.17 1934.1	decided [3] - 2008:3,	1977:9, 1978:17,
currently-available [2]	1952:12, 1953:11	1034.3 1034.10	2008:11, 2093:19	1979:15, 1982:22,
- 2030:1, 2035:23	1953.18 1954.2	1034.12 1034.75	decides [1] - 2131:22	1991:9, 1997:4,
curtailed [1] - 2037:23	1954.5 1954.14	1035.2 1035.12, 1304.23,	decision [2] -	2000:16, 2000:17,
curve [1] - 2047:22	1954.16 1954.17	1002.0, 1800.10,	1954:22, 2094:16	2004:2, 2098:10,
cut [5] - 1934:14,	1955.21 1956.2 THI	E REPORTING G	ROUP ons [1] -	2111:10, 2111:14
			•	
	N	ason & Lockha	art	

demonstratives 111 -	2068:21, 2074:18	2066:6 2067:21	2141.7 2146.9	2118:1, 2118:20
1975:10	2074:20	2069:10, 2069:25,	disagree [2] - 2022:9.	2118:24, 2119:9,
Demonstratives [1] -	detailed [1] - 2015:3	2070:1, 2075:11,	2035:1	2121:2, 2121:3,
1975:15	detect [1] - 2066:21	2077:5, 2077:11,	disappear [1] -	2122:8, 2122:16,
Dennis [2] - 2059:18,	detection [4] -	2077:12, 2077:16,	2070:22	2122:25, 2123:6,
2065:19	2067:22, 2069:17,	2077:17	discern [1] - 2094:3	2123:10, 2123:16,
DEP [1] - 2128:25	2070:5, 2071:17	different [23] -	discernible [1] -	2125:4, 2125:11,
department [1] -	determine [12] -	1929:22, 1930:11,	1974:14	2128:2, 2128:11,
2138:19	1987:21, 1990:18,	1931:4, 1931:8,	discharge [12] -	2129:2, 2129:11,
Department [1] -	2030:10, 2039:16,	1935:19, 1938:5,	1976:14, 1977:10,	2130:4, 2131:22,
2043:19	2060:12, 2104:2,	1940:8, 1954:12,	1979:21, 2010:6,	2132:8, 2136:23,
depleted [1] - 2023:1	2118:3, 2118:10,	1970:7, 2010:22,	2043:4, 2043:9,	2137:6, 2138:9,
depletion [5] -	2118:18, 2119:21,	2032:21, 2062:7,	2043:11, 2047:24,	2138:16, 2141:7,
2027:17, 2072:10,	2120:18, 2144:15	2003.23, 2008.0,	2058:13, 2062:5,	2144.7, 2144.23
2072:13, 2072:19,	aeterminea [4] -	2000.7, 2003.2, 2003.16	2062:16, 2088:21	2122.21,
2073:14	2090.18, 2121.15,	2093.13, 2093.10, 2098.23, 2102.8	aischarges [4] -	2122.23, 2127.10,
aepietions [11] -	2120.0, 2120.4	2114.19 2118.7	2057.9, 2057.10,	2120:0, 2120:0, 2120:0, 2130:11
2000.4, 2015.21,	2124·22	2130:5	discharging [4] -	2133:18, 2136:25
2015.25, 2019.2, 2023.18, 2028.22	developed [17] -	difficult [2] - 2018:5,	1962·21	District's [2] - 2129:4,
2020:10, 2020:22, 2029:17, 2073:20	1929.22 1930.3	2102:18	discipline (3) -	2144:9
2075:17, 2089:23	1942:15, 1942:21,	digital [1] - 2071:5	2041:7. 2041:11.	district-wide [1] -
2096:10	2007:4, 2007:7,	direct [56] - 1972:16,	2085:18	2122:21
deposition [23] -	2007:20, 2024:10,	1973:6, 1977:21,	disciplines [1] -	districts [2] - 2124:17,
1938:14, 1942:24,	2029:9, 2029:16,	1977:22, 1977:25,	2085:17	2124:22
1943:2, 1943:14,	2029:21, 2029:22,	1978:15, 1980:5,	disclosed [1] - 2032:6	Division [1] - 2083:6
1947:10, 1954:25,	2036:12, 2036:14,	1982:1, 1982:15,	discover [1] - 2121:18	Doctor [19] - 1928:17,
1958:9, 1958:25,	2036:17, 2059:17,	1986:13, 1986:15,	discrete [1] - 1950:1	2046:3, 2055:12,
1998:12, 1998:17,	2135:13	1989:9, 1989:15,	discretion [4] -	2056:8, 2062:2,
2013:1, 2015:2,	developers [1] -	1990:14, 1990:24,	1965:6, 1965:8,	2065:12, 2072:3,
2021:21, 2025:11,	2036:10	1991:12, 1993:8,	1965:13, 2094:4	2073:15, 2074:9,
2027:6, 2031:14,	development [1] -	1994:4, 1995:21,	discuss [2] - 1936:5,	2075:9, 2080:22,
2032:6, 2032:16,	2127:25	1990.24, 1997.15, 1007:21, 1000:15	1973:7	2088:18, 2090:3,
2032:25, 2039:22,	DEVIN [1] - 1925:18	1997.21, 1999.15, 1999.16, 1999.23	discussed [8] -	2090:11, 2093:18, 2003:10, 2003:10
2119:24, 2120:7, 2120:21	Devin [1] - 2052:23	2000.19 2000.22	1980:8, 2068:9,	2095.19, 2095.10, 2096·22, 2099·11
2120.21 denths 121 - 2016:14	Devora [1] - 1928:22	2001:1. 2001:9.	2097:14, 2098:3,	doctor [3] - 2042.19
2016·17 2016·22	diagnosing (4)	2001:14, 2002:12,	2098:12, 2112:20,	2053:6. 2092:9
describe [11] - 2041.6	2102-17	2009:6, 2023:14,	2135.7, 2140.7	document [16] -
2060:23, 2073:9	die 111 - 2085:3	2030:16, 2034:17,	1000.17 2008.7	1945:21, 1946:8,
2073:10, 2086:23,	die-offs [1] - 2085:3	2060:16, 2072:4,	2127:25	1948:3, 1967:25,
2091:13, 2092:25,	difference [28] -	2074:4, 2091:17,	discussing [2] -	2078:14, 2082:21,
2130:2, 2141:17,	1971:3. 1993:24.	2097:9, 2097:14,	2000:8. 2060:3	2090:9, 2091:22,
2142:2, 2142:25	1994:19, 1995:1,	2097:18, 2098:7,	discussion [6] -	2108:6, 2115:2,
described [5] -	1995:14, 1995:23,	2099:25, 2100:14,	1993:8, 1995:21,	2116:1, 2116:9,
2035:14, 2042:24,	2006:21, 2011:9,	2100:18, 2101:1,	2028:9, 2036:5,	2117:8, 2117:9,
2074:5, 2106:7,	2011:12, 2011:16,	2101:5, 2106:6,	2091:16, 2097:17	2136:6, 2136:12
2143:5	2011:19, 2011:23,	2107.7, 2107.23, 2111.12, 2114.25	discussions [1] -	documents [3] -
describing [3] -	2012:2, 2012:18,	2117.12, 2114.23, 2117.10, 2125.18	2114:8	2045:12, 2122:13,
1946:17, 1956:12,	2012:23, 2017:3,	2133·4	disinterested [1] -	2140.21 dollars (4) 2130:0
2080.10	2017:21, 2017:23,	Direct [1] - 1926:2	2149:8	done (24) - 2000:17
1031-23	2018:1, 2018:2,	DIRECT [2] - 1928:11,	dispute [1] - 1995:9	2013:20 2019:7
	2010.3, 2018:4, 2018:15, 2064:25	2107:5	aistinction [2] -	2021:14 2022:19
2012-25	2010.13, 2004.23, 2102.23, 2102.23	directly [9] - 1983:3,	2064:2, 2065:4	2035:19, 2039:5.
designed (5) -	2144.1	1988:12, 1988:18,	2007:18	2063:17, 2066:3,
1960:18. 1961:16	differences [17] -	2017:6, 2021:4,	distributed 141	2074:13, 2078:24,
1961:23, 1963:16,	2010:23, 2011:1.	2034:12, 2121:12,	2127·19	2079:12, 2093:20,
1963:18	2012:5, 2012:11,	2127:22, 2129:3	District (31) - 2107:25	2094:25, 2118:2,
Destouni [3] -	2012:13, 2050:1 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP 23, 2109:4	2118:21, 2118:25,
	τ./	[]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	IV			-

67 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

2119:9, 2120:14,	2018:12, 2019:8,	draw-down [2] -	1998:5, 1998:10,	2103:24
2120:18, 2130:3,	2019:13, 2019:20,	2118:9, 2119:15	2063:24, 2064:2,	ecosystems [8] -
2130:6, 2139:4	2020:6, 2020:21,	drier [2] - 2104:6,	2066:10, 2066:11,	2084:20, 2084:25,
dots [2] - 2141:24	2021:4, 2021:8,	2132:12	2103:7, 2103:8	2085:4, 2085:6,
doubled [2] - 2116:10,	2021:16, 2021:18,	driven [41] - 1929:23,	dry [20] - 1959:11,	2085:25, 2086:7,
2116:12	2021:20, 2022:2,	1930:1, 1930:2,	1960:1, 1961:8,	2099:18
doubt [4] - 1991:19,	2022:10, 2022:16,	1930:14, 1930:18,	1961:13, 1962:20,	Edmiston [1] - 2143:5
2012:6, 2050:11,	2024:24, 2025:8,	1930:22, 1931:17,	1963:3, 1980:21,	effect [3] - 1991:21,
2096:11	2025:10, 2025:12,	1934:1, 1934:3,	1999:3, 1999:6,	2081:21, 2094:22
down [23] - 1938:18,	2025.22, 2025.25, 2026.11	1934:10, 1934:12,	1999.9, 2003.5, 2004.20, 2004.22	efficiency [1] -
1946:20, 1988:24,	2020.0, 2020.11,	1934.25, 1935.8,	2004.20, 2004.22, 2110.1 2110.23	1951:20
1969.24, 2001.10, 2044:11, 2046:12	2026:19, 2026:23	1935.10, 1930.0, 1936:12 1936:24	2110.1, 2110.23,	eirort [1] - 2014.19
2044.11, 2040.12, 2048:15, 2052:17	2026:24 2027:1	1930.12, 1930.24,	2113:1 2132:5	eight [1] - 1962.9
2040.13, 2032.17, 2081.17, 2084.18	2027:4. 2027:24.	1941·11 1941·17	2132:9	2002:4 2005:10
2088·1 2102·8	2028:7. 2028:10.	1942.14 1942.16	Dry [3] - 2110:5.	2002.4, 2005.10,
2104:13, 2112:14	2028:13, 2028:19,	1942:20, 1944:21,	2110:7. 2110:10	2000.1, 2024.20,
2118:9. 2119:15.	2028:24, 2029:4,	1950:10, 1950:14,	due [11] - 2012:4,	2074.21 2100.11
2128:15, 2140:24,	2029:12, 2029:15,	1951:4, 1951:8,	2012:7, 2012:19,	2126:12, 2130:10
2142:12, 2142:16,	2029:20, 2029:21,	1953:11, 1953:18,	2049:20, 2055:9,	electronic [1] - 2044:9
2143:4	2029:25, 2030:5,	1954:2, 1954:14,	2061:22, 2061:25,	electronically [1] -
downhill [2] - 1988:1,	2030:9, 2030:17,	1954:17, 1956:20,	2072:11, 2072:13,	2044:14
2041:19	2030:25, 2031:7,	1956:24, 1957:2,	2082:7, 2096:12	elevation [1] - 2047:18
downloaded [1] -	2031:14, 2031:20,	1958:19, 1959:16,	DUNLAP [1] - 1925:23	eliminating [2] -
2062:19	2032:6, 2032:15,	1960:3, 1960:21	during [20] - 1971:9,	1935:10, 1967:21
downstream [8] -	2032:17, 2032:19,	driving [2] - 2044:6,	1971:10, 1992:10,	elimination [7] -
1987:24, 1988:3,	2032:25, 2033:5,	2077:17	2009:2, 2010:17,	1932:4, 1932:11,
1989:21, 1990:2,	2033:12, 2033:16,	drop [3] - 1983:23,	2029:18, 2045:25,	1932:15, 1968:5,
1991:14, 1991:16,	2033:20, 2034:5,	1984:14, 2139:11	2078:8, 2078:10,	1968:12, 1968:16,
1992:20, 2046:24	2034:10, 2034:15,	drop-nozzle [1] -	2096:5, 2102:25,	1969:13
dozen [1] - 2138:12	2034:18, 2035:18,	2139:11	2110:1, 2110:23,	Ellis [1] - 1928:23
Dr [158] - 1927:13,	2035.19, 2036.2,	dropped [1] - 2051:19	2111:2, 2113:1,	empty [2] - 1962:8,
1927:14, 1927:17,	2030.5, 2030.6, 2036:16, 2036:23	drought [42] -	2113:6, 2120:21,	1962:12
1928:13, 1929:12,	2030.10, 2030.23, 2037:4_2037:9	1964:22, 1992:4,	2122:9, 2122:16,	enclosed [1] -
1929:14, 1931:15,	2037.4, 2037.5, 2041.6	1993:25, 1994:1,	2128.9	2083:19
1933:20, 1934:3,	2042:16, 2055:14.	1994:7, 1994:13,	E	encoded [1] - 2068:5
1937:13, 1942:24,	2056:25, 2057:12,	1994.15, 1994.21, 1005:4, 1005:6	E	End [1] - 2148:25
1943.2, 1943.10, 10/6:5 10/7:0	2065:12, 2065:19,	1995.4, 1995.0,	e-mail [1] - 2146:19	end [9] - 1985:3,
1940.3, 1947.9,	2066:3, 2068:16,	1995.15, 1995.16,	early [5] - 1984:20,	2046:10, 2046:12,
1954.25 1955.6	2074:15, 2086:12,	2022:4 2029:18	1985:1, 1985:7,	2063:12, 2113:24,
1958:24 1959:7	2087:19, 2088:7,	2060:21, 2061:1	2011:6, 2011:13	2131:25, 2139:11,
1961:25, 1967:2,	2091:16, 2091:22,	2061:12, 2064:5,	easier [1] - 1975:17	2142.15, 2147.5
1967:5, 1967:14,	2092:1, 2094:25,	2064:8, 2064:11,	east [1] - 2004:15	2130-11
1968:4, 1970:6,	2097:3, 2097:8,	2064:13, 2064:18,	East [1] - 2104:13	endangered [2] -
1975:6, 1976:7,	2098:1, 2098:6,	2064:22, 2065:2,	easy [2] - 2137:10,	2088·8
1977:9, 1985:18,	2098:18, 2099:5,	2065:6, 2072:17,	2138:3	ends [1] - 1984:25
1986:7, 1992:18,	2106:6, 2111:12,	2073:23, 2082:3,	ecological [2] -	enforced [1] - 2087:18
1997:5, 1999:23,	2111:20, 2111:24,	2082:4, 2082:7,	2088:6	eniov [1] - 2148:17
2003:19, 2012:16,	2147:18	2093:6, 2101:15,	ecologist [1] -	ensemble [2] -
2013:12, 2013:20,	draft [1] - 1946:10	2102:24, 2102:25,	2086:14	2075:4. 2075:6
2013:25, 2014:5,	drafted [1] - 2031:20	2103:4, 2103:5,	ecology [2] - 2099:13,	ensure [1] - 2007:11
2014:8, 2014:23,	01721115 [4] - 2047.2,	2122:10, 2122:17	2124.13	enter [2] - 1941:7,
2015:4, 2015:5,	2002.1, 2002.0, 2073:3	arougnts [20] -	1967:3 2007:0	2144:23
2015:7, 2015:11,	dramatic 141 - 2057-22	19/1:7, 19/1:8,	ecosystem [11] -	entering [5] - 1938:25,
2010.10, 2010.19, 2015-25, 2016-9	dramatically 141 -	1971.9, 1971.10, 1073-21 1072-25	2052:1. 2081.4	1939:4, 1941:21,
2013.23, 2010.0, 2016:16:2016:20	2056:24	1973.21, 1973.20, 1974.2 1993.16	2081:5. 2084:13.	1981:21, 2038:15
2016:22 2017:7	draw [2] - 2118:9.	1993:20 1993:21	2085:25, 2086:9,	enters [1] - 1941:13
2017:8. 2017:13.	2119:15		1	entire [9] - 1955:18,
,	1'HI	- REPORTING G	KUUP 15, 2102:18,	1985:19, 1995:14,

2113:21, 2119:4,	
2136:25, 2137:3,	
2137:5, 2143:12	
entitled [1] - 1925:10	e
environmental [2] -	
1946:10, 2133:20	e
envision [1] - 2083:23	
EPA [3] - 2079:10	
2080:25 2083:6	e
equal (3) - 1989:3	
2020.17 2051.14	
equating 141 - 2018:17	e
equaling [1] - 2010.17	Ŭ
enol [1] - 2137.20	_
2072:22, 2076:7,	e
2105:17	
ESQ [10] - 1925:17,	
1925:17, 1925:18,	
1925:18, 1925:19,	
1925:20, 1925:21,	e
1925:21, 1925:22,	
1925:23	e
essentially [3] -	
1996:3, 2132:10,	
2141:24	
establish [2] -	
1987:17, 2090:17	
established [5] -	
2080:16, 2081:11,	
2081:15, 2083:2,	e
2083:11	e
establishment [1] -	e
2124:23	
estimate [11] -	e
1935:13, 1935:14,	
1964:8, 1985:17,	e
1985:20, 2020:3	e
2027:20, 2029:17	E
2067:17, 2071:13	
2074.19	
estimated 181 -	
1932.7 2017.13	
2010.20 2010.24	_
2020:10 2020:21	Ŭ
2020.10, 2020.21, 2021.4, 2114.4	
ostimatos [10] -	
2007.12 2014.24	
2007.12,2014.24,	e.
2015.4, 2015.13,	
2013.23, 2010.13,	~
2010.23, 2010.24, 2017:8-2010:5	e
2017.0, 2019.0	
estimation [1] -	
2074:2	
estuarine [1] - 2143:8	
estuary [1] - 2105:18	
ET [1] - 2020:8	
et [3] - 2003:1,	
2036:13, 2036:19	e
evaluate [6] - 1950:3,	e

1960:22, 2019:11, 2035:24, 2120:14, 2140:10 valuated [2] -2016:20, 2114:3 valuates [3] -2109:21, 2110:3, 2110:8 valuating [3] -1963:8, 2018:9, 2083:13 valuation [1] -2028:20 vaporated [2] -2049:13, 2049:16 vaporation [8] -1995:19, 2018:25, 2019:21, 2020:7, 2049:13, 2058:18, 2058:20, 2071:23 vaporative [2] -2019:11, 2020:12 vapotranspiration [14] - 2058:17. 2058:21, 2058:23, 2059:4, 2059:9, 2059:12, 2060:15, 2061:16, 2061:25, 2067:1, 2067:3, 2104:10, 2105:4 vent [1] - 2149:8 vents [1] - 2054:5 ventuality [1] -2147:20 vidence [3] - 1951:7, 1970:10, 2069:8 xactly [1] - 2053:12 xam [1] - 2145:15 XAMINATION [7] -1928:11, 1929:10, 2041:4, 2097:1, 2107:5, 2107:16, 2129:20 xamination [6] -1945:20, 1985:20, 2013:11, 2013:18, 2016:3, 2111:12 xamines [3] -2109:24, 2110:22, 2111:1 xample [14] - 1933:8, 1937:22, 1940:23, 1983:21, 2017:12, 2043:25, 2051:2, 2059:13, 2079:7, 2079:10, 2087:19, 2087:24, 2099:13, 2102:7 xamples [1] - 2011:6 xceeded [8] - 208 THE

2087:8, 2087:9, 2087:11, 2087:15, 2088:25, 2089:2, 2089:4 exceeding [1] -2087:20 Excel [1] - 2056:10 except [4] - 2044:13, 2051:4, 2053:13, 2073:7 exceptionally [2] -1974:3, 1974:5 excerpt [1] - 1945:24 excess [1] - 1965:6 excised [1] - 2103:23 exclusively [1] -2138:24 excuse [4] - 2044:22, 2055:18, 2090:25, 2133:7 excused [1] - 2147:13 executive [3] -2108:21, 2141:7, 2146:9 exercise [2] - 2062:13, 2093:25 exercised [2] -2068:16, 2094:4 Exhibit [2] - 2045:16, 2135:20 exhibit [5] - 1945:22, 1976:23, 2076:19, 2082:22, 2100:4 EXHIBITS [1] - 1926:7 exhibits [2] - 2045:19, 2127:2 exist [1] - 2140:16 existing [5] - 2121:16, 2132:15, 2132:22, 2133:22 exists [2] - 2011:23, 2011:24 expectation [1] -2147:17 expected [1] - 2094:9 expensive [1] -2130:24 experience [1] -2063:12 experienced [1] -1991:18 expert [34] - 1935:25, 1936:3, 1936:4, 1936:16, 1937:10, 1952:20, 1959:10, 1965:11, 2008:1, 2008:8, 2009:7, 2014:4, 2016:17, 2022:16. 2024:20. REPORTING GROUP :23, 2030:6,

2030:25, 2031:7, 2033:12, 2034:10, 2035:18, 2036:3, 2055:14, 2065:13, 2065:20, 2065:22, 2075:25, 2086:13, 2091:17. 2110:12. 2112:21, 2112:25, 2113:5 experts [5] - 1949:2, 1965:5, 2013:13, 2013:21, 2112:1 Expires [1] - 2149:17 explain [6] - 2064:1, 2075:10, 2105:5, 2105:7, 2136:17, 2143:25 explained [3] -2029:15, 2031:15, 2066:7 explaining [1] -2092:2 explanation [2] -2061:21 explicit [1] - 1982:3 explicitly [1] - 2099:5 expressed [1] -2043:14 expression [1] -2070:21 extend [1] - 2067:14 extended [1] -2005:17 extensive [2] - 2066:3, 2094:25 extent [5] - 1945:12, 2042:21, 2057:11, 2063:20, 2068:6 extra [1] - 2094:22 extraordinarily [1] -1945:21 extraordinary [1] -1964:22 extrapolated [1] -2026:6 extreme [1] - 2064:22 extremely [1] - 2078:9 eye [1] - 2011:11 F faces [1] - 1928:25 fact [7] - 1944:4, 2008:1, 2031:18, 2050:5, 2064:23, 2077:19, 2082:5 factor [22] - 2023:13,

2023:16, 2023:21,

2027:15, 2027:21,

2030:18, 2030:22, 2031:1, 2031:8, 2031:16, 2032:2, 2032:13, 2032:19, 2032:20, 2032:22, 2033:1, 2033:6, 2033:10. 2037:1. 2130:24 factors [8] - 2006:11, 2023:25, 2024:3, 2026:8, 2026:10, 2026:14, 2028:9, 2102:17 failed [1] - 2145:13 fair [10] - 2012:16, 2025:13, 2062:3, 2103:6, 2109:18, 2109:22, 2110:8, 2119:11, 2127:13, 2127:18 fairly [1] - 2065:7 faithful [1] - 1963:12 faithfully [2] -1950:15, 1964:4 fall [3] - 2060:10, 2079:6. 2089:4 falling [1] - 2089:3 falls [1] - 2098:2 familiar [14] - 1946:8, 1948:3, 1989:17, 2053:6, 2072:6, 2078:17, 2079:15, 2080:5, 2080:19, 2080:21, 2085:18, 2086:20, 2122:4, 2124:3 familiarity [1] - 2142:4 famous [1] - 2071:10 far [3] - 1940:16, 2057:25, 2092:14 farm [3] - 1932:11, 2019:11, 2142:13 farmer [3] - 2120:25, 2121:3, 2130:7 farmers [3] - 2018:22, 2132:8, 2138:8 farms [2] - 2139:1, 2139:2 faux [1] - 2056:3 **FDACS** [1] - 2115:20 feasibility [2] -2037:10, 2039:5 feasible [2] - 2039:18, 2073:24 feature [1] - 2121:17 featured [1] - 2082:22 features [3] - 2084:7, 2084:10, 2133:24 Feb [1] - 1968:8

69 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

February [11] -

1955:12, 1978:9,	filed [2] - 2109:15,	2111:24	1988:21, 1989:8,	2039:9, 2046:7,
1997:6, 2075:24,	2109:18	Flewelling [14] -	1995:11, 2013:13,	2047:7, 2047:8,
2100:15, 2100:17,	fill [1] - 2072:15	2014:5, 2015:5,	2014:4, 2022:15,	2048:9, 2048:14,
2101:6, 2101:7,	final [5] - 2002:6,	2015:7, 2016:20,	2037:22, 2038:8,	2048:19, 2049:5,
2129:15, 2146:2,	2083:16, 2083:19,	2017:8, 2017:13,	2038:24, 2039:11,	2050:8, 2051:19,
2146:3	2083:22, 2083:24	2019:8, 2019:20,	2044:3, 2045:7,	2054:5, 2054:9,
federal [5] - 1995:9,	finally [3] - 1934:25,	2020:6, 2020:21,	2046:14, 2046:15,	2054:11, 2054:13,
2071:23, 2080:17,	1960:10, 1969:21	2021:4, 2021:8,	2046:16, 2047:10,	2055:3, 2057:4,
2083:2, 2143:15	findings [4] - 2073:10,	2021:16, 2022:2	2073:2, 2073:3,	2057:5, 2057:18,
feeds [1] - 1981:5	2073:11, 2080:6,	Flewelling's [14] -	2073:15, 2073:19,	2061:18, 2067:16,
feet [10] - 2043:14,	2082:12	2014:8, 2014:23,	2077:21, 2078:10,	2067:18, 2072:23,
2043:15, 2047:24,	fine [3] - 2091:25.	2015:4, 2015:11,	2083:7, 2097:4,	2076:11, 2076:12,
2054:11, 2054:19,	2092.2 2138.7	2015:15, 2015:19,	2098:25, 2106:11,	2076:22, 2076:23,
2054:21, 2113:12,	fined [1] - 2138.9	2015:25, 2016:8.	2107:25, 2108:22,	2076:25, 2077:9,
2113:14 2113:17	finely (1) - 2011:11	2016:22, 2017:7.	2112:21, 2113:5,	2077:10, 2077:15,
2119.18	fines (4) 2129:12	2019:13 2021:18	2114:10, 2114:15,	2077:23, 2077:24,
foll [1] = 1980:16	finials w 0147-05	2021.20 2022.10	2114.21 2117.12	2078:3 2078:8
fow (40) 1045:10	finisn [1] - 2147:25	Flint (271 - 1932)6	2117.18 2119.1	2078:11 2080:16
1007.16 2040.18,	TIFST [34] - 1952:21,	1032.12 1035.11	2119.10 2120.14	2080.19 2081.12
1997.10, 2040.12,	1971:21, 1972:18,	1952.12, 1955.11,	2120.15 2120.14,	2000:13, 2001:12, 2082:16
2048:13, 2051:18,	1974:22, 1975:25,	1949.3, 1949.14,	2120.15, 2121.3,	2002.11, 2002.10, 2084.7 2084.10
2002.24, 2070.9,	1998:24, 2028:10,	1900.4, 1909.11,	2120.10, 2120.20, 2124.16 2124.01	2084.15 2085.5
2107:21, 2108:3,	2031:13, 2032:16,	1969:23, 1980:9,	2124.10, 2124.21, 2125.7, 2125.11	2004.15, 2005.5,
2127:21, 2138:12	2032:20, 2033:6,	1981:5, 1981:11,	2123.7, 2123.11,	2000.23, 2000.23,
field [4] - 2054:19,	2038:4, 2048:20,	1981:20, 1986:21,	2120.1, 2129.10,	2009.4, 2009.0,
2063:20, 2101:16,	2048:22, 2051:17,	1988:15, 1989:2,	2130:4, 2130:6,	2090:2, 2092:15,
2131:19	2053:20, 2070:10,	2002:10, 2003:1,	2135:8, 2135:14,	2094:22, 2096:8,
fields [1] - 2059:14	2071:3, 2071:5,	2004:15, 2004:16,	2135:18, 2136:16,	2100:5, 2100:22,
fifth [1] - 1969:21	2074:15, 2083:14,	2004:24, 2005:12,	2136:24, 2140:18,	2103:13, 2104:8,
figure [59] - 1936:19,	2083:18, 2083:21,	2042:25, 2044:16,	2141:13, 2141:22,	2104:10, 2104:17
1972:20, 1972:21,	2091:19, 2091:23,	2044:17, 2046:13,	2142:5, 2144:20,	flowing [9] - 1988:1,
1972:25, 1973:5,	2108:25, 2128:19,	2046:24, 2046:25,	2147:10	1992:22, 2041:17,
1973:7, 1973:15,	2130:6, 2134:7,	2050:20, 2051:13,	Florida's [11] - 1967:2,	2043:12, 2043:15,
1973:24, 1974:8,	2135:8, 2137:3,	2078:17, 2079:15,	2097:8, 2112:1,	2047:20, 2055:4,
1974:21, 1976:9,	2137:16, 2137:23	2080:1, 2080:7,	2117:22, 2124:6,	2072:11, 2099:20
1977:21, 1977:24,	first-hand [1] -	2081:11, 2082:24,	2129:24, 2134:11,	flows [143] - 1929:16,
1978:1, 1978:6,	2028:10	2090:1, 2141:21	2134:14, 2134:20,	1931:7, 1931:8,
1978:9, 1978:15,	fiscal [1] - 2010:4	Flint-Ochlockonee [1]	2140:4, 2142:18	1932:20, 1936:20,
1979:8, 1979:13,	Fish [4] - 2080:18,	- 2090:1	Floridan [2] - 2117:23,	1937:16, 1937:25,
1980:5, 1986:14,	2080:24, 2081:2,	float [2] - 2044:10,	2139:15	1938:17, 1939:5,
1990:23, 2002:20,	2081:14	2047:16	flourish [1] - 2084:16	1940:9, 1940:13,
2002:24, 2002:25,	fit [15] - 1950:19.	flood [1] - 2078:9	flow [101] - 1930:11,	1941:16, 1942:11,
2003:11, 2003:12,	1950:22, 1950:25	floors [1] - 2087:15	1930:24, 1933:8,	1949:3, 1949:8,
2003:16, 2003:19,	1951:3, 1951:6	FLORIDA [1] - 1925:3	1933:24, 1934:7,	1949:14, 1953:8,
2003:20, 2003:25,	1951.14 1953.15	Florida [97] - 1925:17,	1934:16, 1934:21,	1953:11, 1960:24,
2004:1, 2004:9,	1955:11 1955:16	1927:11, 1929:17,	1935:2, 1938:10,	1965:24, 1971:2,
2004:10, 2004:12.	1956.21 1957.21	1930:25, 1931:7.	1941:21, 1954:7,	1971:25, 1972:2,
2004:23, 2005:5.	1958:20 1959:17	1932:19, 1932:25.	1955:21, 1957:25,	1972:11, 1974:1,
2005:10, 2005:15,	1960:4 2011:4	1935:3, 1937:25.	1958:7, 1958:12,	1974:10, 1977:15,
2005.18 2005.19	fite rol 1050:22	1939.16 1940.20	1959:15, 1960:10,	1979:12, 1979:25,
2005:21, 2006:1	1054:21	1941:5, 1942:11	1963:5, 1966:15,	1980:12, 1980:16,
2009.8 2009.10	1934.21	1944.7 1944.11	1971:21. 1971:23.	1980:23, 1981:14,
2009.19 2010.15	1044:19 4044:10,	1948.20 1949.7	1972:14, 1972:22,	1981:19, 1981:20,
2011:3 2053:7	1944:18, 1944:20,	1962.17 1962.22	1973:12, 1974:8.	1981:23, 1982:8,
2055.13 2075.25	1944:22, 1944:25,	1963:5 1965:1	1974:20, 1978:7	1982:14, 1983:1.
2000.10, 2010.20, 20176.10	1945:1, 1957:23,	1965.4 1965.11	1978:14, 1982:19	1983:5, 1983:10.
2070.2, 2070.19, 2111.11 2111.1 <i>1</i>	1958:3, 1965:22,	1070-15 1070-22	1988:12, 1988:18	1983:23, 1984:1.
2111.11, 2111.14,	2036:5, 2051:3,	1081.1. 1081.8	1989.21, 1990.2	1984:4, 1984:7.
2111.20, 2141.3, 21/1.18	2098:13, 2098:23	1001.4, 1301.0, 1001.16 1001.01	1991.18 1992.2	1984:12, 1984:14
∠141.10	tlag [1] - 2013:18	1901.10, 1901.21, 1002:1 1002:11	1992.11 1992.20	1984:18, 1984:21
1190165 [3] - 2004:3, 2075:22	flashing [1] - 2045:1	1903.1, 1903.11,	00106 2038·12	1984:24, 1985:8
2013.22	flewelling [1] - TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP 14 2038 23	1985:9, 1987:1
	M	Iason & Lockha	rt	,

1987:19, 1987:22,	2006:18, 2069:22,	FX-785 [9] - 1926:13,	2043:23, 2043:24,	1935:17, 1936:11,
1988:1, 1988:5,	2075:8, 2148:15	1937:11, 1937:13,	2057:9	1936:14, 1936:20,
1988:15, 1988:16,	foregoing [1] - 2149:4	1952:21, 1953:1,	gained [1] - 2002:15	1937:15, 1937:24,
1988:24, 1989:2,	foresters [1] - 2142:14	1955:9, 1955:13,	gaining [9] - 1989:17,	1938:9, 1939:14,
1989:4, 1989:7,	forests [1] - 2087:25	2009:7	1989:20, 1989:24,	1940:10, 1940:24,
1989:12, 1989:24,	form [1] - 2046:14	FX-862a [4] - 1926:13,	1990:9, 1992:12,	1941:6, 1941:22,
1990:5, 1990:19,	formed [2] - 2068:13,	2115:1, 2115:10,	1992:19, 1992:21,	1942:5, 1949:2,
1991:23, 1991:24,	2073:25	2115:22	1993:1, 2002:15	1949:4, 1960:16,
1992:10, 1995:11,	forming [1] - 2141:21		gallons [3] - 2119:17,	1963:8, 1963:19,
1996:6, 2006:18,	formula [1] - 2085:9	G	2142:21, 2142:23	1963:21, 1964:5,
2006:19, 2006:22,	forward [3] - 2069:22,		gap [1] - 2050:24	1966:10, 1967:21,
2006:23, 2007:8,	2081:15, 2130:21	Gage [54] - 1971:4,	gaps [2] - 2090:18,	1970:10, 1970:16,
2009:13, 2009:16,	four [10] - 1945:23,	1971:5, 1971:22,	2092:11	1970:22, 1972:6,
2010:21, 2010:22,	1947:19, 1948:10,	1971:24, 1972:12,	general [2] - 2008:18,	1972:10, 1974:17,
2010:24, 2016:7,	1949:11, 1971:20,	1972:23, 1973:1,	2130:6	1980:24, 1981:17,
2023:10, 2037:22,	1997:24, 2031:14,	1976:15, 1977:11,	generally [3] - 2122:6,	1986:25, 1993:19,
2038:4, 2039:18,	2048:23, 2139:22,	1978:3, 1979:22,	2130:2, 2136:19	1994:1, 1994:14,
2041:19, 2041:20,	2148:11	1980:8, 1980:9,	generate [1] - 2097:11	1995:2, 1995:16,
2044:3, 2044:17,	four-day [1] - 2148:11	1980:13, 1983:17,	generated [4] -	1996:11, 2000:13,
2046:10, 2046:12,	fourth [2] - 2032:19	1986:12, 1986:18,	1939:4. 1949:3.	2006:5, 2006:24,
2046:15, 2049:1,	2032:24	1988:6, 1990:16,	1966:6. 2033:17	2011:21, 2012:4,
2049:10, 2049:11,	fraction [1] - 1996:5	1990:25, 1991:13,	aenesis [1] - 2135:15	2012:7, 2012:9,
2050:2, 2050:23,	frame [1] - 2108.7	1991:14, 1991:18,	gentleman [1] -	2012:19, 2014:1,
2051:13, 2051:14,	free [1] - 1992.22	1991:19, 1991:24,	2071:7	2014:24, 2016:5,
2051:21, 2053:12,	free-flowing [1] -	1992:1, 1992:6,	geography [1] -	2022:18, 2028:2,
2054:24, 2055:5,	1992·22	1992:9, 1992:12,	2143:1	2031:17, 2033:12,
2060:14, 2065:13,	froozo (4) - 2131:6	1992:14, 1993:6,	Geological 141 -	2034:9, 2037:10,
2067:7, 2067:8,	frequency [4] -	1993:9, 1996:16,	2043·5 2043·18	2037:13, 2037:19,
2067:9, 2067:10,	2054.5 2087.0	2009:17, 2015:22,	2083:5 2088:22	2037:23, 2038:6,
2067:12, 2076:8,	2007.3, 2007.3, 2002.23, 2003.4	2043:25, 2044:1,	George [4] - 1926:3	2038:16, 2041:12,
2076:10, 2076:13,	frequently [2] -	2044:19, 2045:15,	1927.13 1928.4	2049:6, 2055:14,
2076:21, 2077:4,	1072.3 2080.21	2045:17, 2046:4,	1945.14	2071:14, 2078:22,
2078:1, 2079:1,	1972.3, 2009.21, 2080-22	2046:16, 2046:21,	GEORGIA [1] - 1925.6	2080:6, 2082:13,
2079:14, 2081:3,	front [7] 1028-13	2046:22, 2050:20,	Georgia M31 -	2095:19, 2103:12,
2084:11, 2088:4,	1037·10 1030·11	2050:25, 2052:2,	1925.20 1937.5	2104:20, 2107:21,
2094:9, 2094:12,	1058.23 2021.10	2052:5, 2052:6,	1937.19 1938.13	2147:22
2094:20, 2095:17,	2028·11 2128·18	2055:6, 2073:2,	1963.15, 1967.6	given [8] - 2012:22,
2096:10, 2102:1,	frost (1) - 2131.6	2092:19, 2093:13	1967.15 1981.11	2029:1, 2094:19,
2109:8, 2109:25,	frost_froozo [4] -	gage [24] - 1972:25,	1981:15, 2000:21	2102:23, 2114:2,
2112:22, 2113:1,	2131.6	1977:17, 1980:7,	2003:8. 2029:17	2114:4, 2142:4
2114:10, 2119:1,	ESAID (4) 21/11/1/	1980:16, 1981:8,	2038:3, 2038:11	goal [1] - 2008:25
2119:11, 2120:16,	full m 1045.22	1981:15, 1982:24,	2055:7, 2065:13	God [2] - 1927:23,
2124:4	10/6.1 2036.7	1980:10, 1989:2,	2071:21, 2071:22,	2106:18
flying [1] - 2062:11	fully 121 - 2037:16	1990.15, 1990.19, 1001:6, 1002:22	2073:8. 2073:21.	goodness [14] -
focus [5] - 2067:7,	2063·19	1991.0, 1992.23, 1003:4 1006:14	2078:13, 2081:23.	1950:19, 1950:22,
2076:9, 2078:1,	function (4) - 2084-12	1995.4, 1990.14,	2083:7, 2090:15,	1950:25, 1951:3,
2078:6, 2078:7	2084·20 2084·24	2043.12, 2044.4, 2011.5, 2011.10	2093:3, 2096:4.	1951:6, 1951:14,
focused [7] - 1954:6,	2004.20, 2004.24, 21/6·17	2044.3, 2044.19,	2096:6, 2096:13,	1953:15, 1955:11,
2005:12, 2031:10,	fundamental 121	2040.24, 2052.11,	2096:16, 2111:22,	1955:16, 1956:21,
2053:16, 2076:13,	1074.18 2006.15	2000.2, 2100.4	2112:2, 2112:16,	1957:21, 1958:20,
2081:8, 2092:14	2006·20	1000.20 1001.1	2134:11, 2135:17,	1959:17, 1960:3
folks [3] - 2135:1,	funding (2) - 2128-10	1990.20, 1991.1,	2136:15, 2140:16,	Gordon [13] - 2002:21,
2142:15, 2146:7	2128.13	1991. 4 , 1992.22, 1003:3, 2011.45	2140:18, 2141:4,	2003:1, 2003:12,
follow [3] - 2058:10,	futuro (c) 1037:5	1995.5, 2044.15, 2044:20, 2046:3	2141:22, 2142:9,	2003:14, 2004:1,
2066:22, 2140:12	1037.15 1027.10	2044.20, 2040.3, 2051.1 2058.3	2144:19, 2144:22,	2004:12, 2004:19,
followed [1] - 2071:16	1930.10, 1937.19,	2004.1,2000.0, 2063.1 2062.2	2145:20	2005:1, 2005:5,
following [2] -	1939.14, 1940.23,	2003.1, 2003.2, 2063:4, 2063:16	Georgia's [77] -	2005:7, 2005:16,
2036:12, 2129:12	futuro_uso (4) 10/11-5	2003. 4 , 2003.10, 2110:6	1929:16, 1930:23,	2005:19, 2005:21
food [1] - 2085:1	FY_500 [1] - 1841.0	2110.0 naning (6) - 2043-6	1933:22, 1934:14,	gorgeous [1] - 2088:3
forecast [5] - 2006:13,	2082·21 THE	E REPORTING G	ROUP 1, 1935:10,	gosh [1] - 2055:23
			۱ _.	
	1/1	agan (Logicha	¥+	4

71 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

doverning [1] - 2125 3	arow [1] - 2104·15	handle [1] - 1961-16	2051.11 2053.11	1943.2 1943.18
government [1] -	grower [1] - 2132.4	hannily [1] - 2147.19	2093:2	1946:5, 1947:9
2131·17	growers [4] - 2138:4	happing [1] = 2147.10	himself [2] - 2025:23	1947 15 1950 2
Governor [4] -	2138.21 2138.25	1085.12 1085.1 <i>/</i>	2029.12	1954.25 1955.6
2128·23	2130.21, 2130.23, 2130.22	2013:21 2040:15	historic (5) - 1971.8	1958:24, 1959:7
Graham [2] - 2109.1	arowth [1] - 1994.14	2010:21, 2040:10, 2040:19	1971.10 1993.15	1961:25, 1968:4
2109:3	guess (5) - 1976:3	hard 151 - 1975-12	1993:21, 2066:10	1970:6. 1975:6.
grant (3) - 2131-22	2037·21 2132·1	2004.5 2005.15	historical [4] - 1933:5	1976:7. 1977:9.
2132.16 2135.9	2137:3 2144.2	2048.20 2087.12	2066.6 2089.11	1985:18, 1986:7.
granted [1] - 2094-4	auidelines 181 -	harm 131 - 2088:6	2093:24	1992:18, 1997:5.
granting [2] - 2004.4	1946·18 2082·24	2144·16 2144·19	Historical III -	2003:19, 2012:16,
2135.7	2084.6 2085.7	harmful [1] - 2124.13	2115:14	2013:12, 2013:20,
graph [2] - 1984-25	2086:24 2087:10	harvesting 111 -	historically [1] -	2013:25, 2018:12,
1985:3	2087:14, 2089:9	2131:5	2002:14	2028:13, 2037:9,
graphical (1) - 1954-8	auns (1) - 2139:11	hate [1] - 2131:1	hold [1] - 1945:15	2040:3, 2041:6,
grass [1] - 2139-19	auv [1] - 2142:5	heading [1] - 1946-16	holiday [1] - 2148:8	2042:16, 2091:22,
great (6) - 2045:23	guys [1] - 2131·12	healthy [1] - 2051:25	Honor [68] - 1927:6.	2092:1, 2097:3,
2058.4 2063.9	GX-1100 171 - 1926 16	heard (6) - 2042.19	1927:7. 1927:10	2111:24, 2147:18
2088:17, 2148:15	1939:10, 1939:13	2052:8, 2062:24	1927:12, 1928:6.	Hornberger's [6] -
greater [5] - 1993:20	1939:23, 1940:5.	2067:25, 2091:24	1928:18, 1942:23,	1942:24, 1999:23,
2020:10. 2020:11	1940:8. 1942:1	2099:13	1945:18, 1975:9,	2091:16, 2106:6,
2020:18. 2113:20	GX-455 [5] - 1926:16.	HEARING [1] -	1975:24, 1976:4,	2111:12, 2111:20
green [3] - 2047:1.	2108:14, 2109:6,	1925:10	1976:25, 1985:11,	hour [3] - 1985:21,
2101:20, 2104:7	2112:19, 2113:10	hearing [3] - 1927:13,	1986:5, 1999:22,	2040:14, 2147:23
arid [3] - 2060:1.	GX-526 [4] - 1926:15,	1927:21, 2106:16	2013:15, 2013:16,	hour-and-a-half [1] -
2062:21, 2062:24	2127:5, 2127:8,	heavy [1] - 2053:21	2040:7, 2040:10,	1985:21
gridded [4] - 2059:16,	2145:21	held [2] - 1925:11,	2040:23, 2041:22,	hours [2] - 1985:21,
2062:18, 2062:25,	GX-529 [6] - 1926:15,	1945:10	2042:6, 2042:11,	2058:15
2063:18	2127:6, 2127:11,	help [7] - 1927:23,	2045:2, 2045:14,	house [1] - 2101:17
gritty [1] - 2131:2	2145:21, 2147:1,	2041:11, 2049:5,	2052:12, 2052:18,	human [5] - 2006:15,
groundwater [50] -	2147:5	2106:18, 2138:25,	2052:22, 2055:17,	2049:20, 2049:24,
1971:17, 1986:25,		2146:1, 2147:4	2055:25, 2056:3,	2064:15, 2082:7
1987:3, 1987:4,	Н	helpful [3] - 1976:22,	2079:21, 2079:23,	humans [1] - 2105:8
1987.8 1987.11			2002.10 2001.2	
1007.0, 1007.11,	hehitet in 2001.7	1977:4, 1982:16	2082.19, 2091.3,	hundreds [2] -
1987:15, 1987:18,	habitat [2] - 2081:7,	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitata (4) - 2087:22	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2,
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 habitats [1] - 2087:23	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:11 1935:10	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3	2082:19, 2091:3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] -
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13 1985:21	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:12	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] -	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:10, 2105:25	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] -
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2023:24, 2024:14,	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:13, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2027:5
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:04	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hurdialogia [20]
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:22, 2026:2	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6.	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1 1933:4
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:40	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13.	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5 1933:40
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2020:9	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18.	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2145:18.	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5,	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2145:18, 2147:3, 2147:11.	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:0	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14,	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20,	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2145:18, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:13, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2064:0, 2004:10	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2145:18, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11 1970:8
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:4, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:13, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] -	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitating [1] - 213:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:14, 2442:2	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:14, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highet [7] - 2070:8	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:19, 1970:25.
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11 handbook [1] -	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2011:26	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] -	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:19, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2.
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2121:25.	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11 handbook [1] - 2133:10	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2112:6	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] - 1926:3, 1927:13,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:19, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2, 1986:8, 1993:18,
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2121:25, 2124:18, 2126:17	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11 handbook [1] - 2133:10 handed [6] - 2088:16,	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2112:6 highlighted [4] - 1977:14, 4070:24	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2145:18, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] - 1926:3, 1927:13, 1927:14, 1927:17,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:19, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2, 1986:8, 1993:18, 2002:6, 2012:14,
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2121:25, 2124:18, 2126:17 groundwater/	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:1, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11 handbook [1] - 2133:10 handed [6] - 2088:16, 2107:7, 2108:14,	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 high [1] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2112:6 highlighted [4] - 1977:14, 1979:24, 2017:13, 2077:8	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] - 1926:3, 1927:13, 1927:14, 1927:17, 1928:5, 1928:13,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:9, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2, 1986:8, 1993:18, 2002:6, 2012:14, 2037:21, 2037:24,
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2121:25, 2124:18, 2126:17 groundwater/ surface [1] - 2024:7	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:13, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11 handbook [1] - 2133:10 handed [6] - 2088:16, 2107:7, 2108:14, 2120:7, 2127:5,	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2112:6 highlighted [4] - 1977:14, 1979:24, 2017:13, 2077:8 highlighting [7] -	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] - 1926:3, 1927:13, 1927:14, 1927:17, 1928:5, 1928:13, 1929:12, 1929:14,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:9, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2, 1986:8, 1993:18, 2002:6, 2012:14, 2037:21, 2037:24, 2039:5, 2050:10,
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:24, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2121:25, 2124:18, 2126:17 groundwater/ surface [1] - 2024:7 Group [1] - 2115:19	habitat [2] - 2081:7, 2143:7 habitats [1] - 2087:23 half [7] - 1931:21, 1935:13, 1935:10, 1935:13, 1985:21, 2055:13, 2073:23 halfway [1] - 2001:16 hand [17] - 1927:19, 1929:7, 1942:24, 1977:1, 1994:9, 1994:10, 2004:6, 2028:10, 2064:13, 2079:18, 2086:18, 2088:12, 2090:5, 2092:15, 2106:14, 2141:11, 2149:10 hand-identified [1] - 2141:11 handbook [1] - 2133:10 handed [6] - 2088:16, 2107:7, 2108:14, 2120:7, 2127:5, 2145:20	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2039:18 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2112:6 highlighted [4] - 1977:14, 1979:24, 2017:13, 2077:8 highlighting [7] - 2048:5, 2048:6	2082.19, 2091.3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully [1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] - 1926:3, 1927:13, 1927:14, 1927:17, 1928:5, 1928:13, 1929:12, 1929:14, 1931:15, 1933:20,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2, 1986:8, 1993:18, 2002:6, 2012:14, 2039:5, 2050:10, 2091:25, 2096:20
1987:15, 1987:18, 2002:7, 2002:8, 2002:13, 2002:15, 2002:17, 2003:8, 2022:13, 2022:19, 2023:4, 2023:9, 2023:16, 2023:21, 2023:24, 2024:4, 2024:9, 2024:14, 2024:21, 2025:5, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:6, 2025:21, 2025:23, 2026:3, 2026:7, 2026:10, 2028:2, 2029:8, 2030:11, 2033:12, 2033:16, 2034:9, 2035:20, 2053:21, 2055:9, 2060:13, 2117:23, 2118:2, 2118:3, 2118:6, 2118:21, 2121:25, 2124:18, 2126:17 groundwater/ surface [1] - 2024:7 Group [1] - 2115:19 groups [1] - 2143:15	$\begin{array}{r} \mbox{habitat} [2] - 2081:7, \\ 2143:7 \\ \mbox{habitats} [1] - 2087:23 \\ \mbox{half} [7] - 1931:21, \\ 1935:13, 1935:10, \\ 1935:13, 1935:10, \\ 1935:13, 1985:21, \\ 2055:13, 2073:23 \\ \mbox{halfway} [1] - 2001:16 \\ \mbox{hand} [17] - 1927:19, \\ 1929:7, 1942:24, \\ 1977:1, 1994:9, \\ 1994:10, 2004:6, \\ 2028:10, 2064:13, \\ 2079:18, 2086:18, \\ 2088:12, 2090:5, \\ 2092:15, 2106:14, \\ 2141:21, 2149:10 \\ \mbox{hand-identified} [1] - \\ 2141:11 \\ \mbox{hand-identified} [1] - \\ 2133:10 \\ \mbox{handed} [6] - 2088:16, \\ 2107:7, 2108:14, \\ 2120:7, 2127:5, \\ 2145:20 \\ \mbox{handing} [1] - 2127 \\ \end{tabular}$	1977:4, 1982:16 helping [1] - 2145:14 helps [2] - 2007:11, 2070:19 hereby [1] - 2149:3 Herschel [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2128:24 hesitate [1] - 2143:18 hesitating [1] - 2039:13 high [11] - 1999:8, 2015:16, 2015:20, 2016:9, 2041:18, 2075:2, 2076:11, 2078:1, 2078:9, 2082:2, 2088:4 higher [7] - 1983:20, 2038:22, 2039:9, 2061:9, 2061:10, 2064:11, 2143:3 highest [2] - 2076:8, 2112:6 highlighted [4] - 1977:14, 1979:24, 2017:13, 2077:8 highlighting [7] - 2048:5 2048:6 E REPORTING GI	2082:19, 2091:3, 2091:10, 2091:14, 2092:7, 2095:13, 2096:23, 2096:25, 2099:7, 2099:10, 2100:14, 2100:25, 2103:1, 2103:16, 2105:11, 2105:13, 2105:19, 2105:25, 2106:10, 2106:11, 2107:3, 2107:13, 2108:8, 2111:15, 2115:4, 2120:2, 2126:25, 2135:23, 2145:13, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2147:3, 2147:11, 2147:15, 2148:4, 2148:19 hopefully[1] - 2134:7 horizon [1] - 2050:9 Hornberger [48] - 1926:3, 1927:13, 1927:14, 1927:17, 1928:5, 1928:13, 1929:12, 1929:14, 1931:15, 1933:20, ROUP :3, 1937:13,	hundreds [2] - 1962:21, 1963:4 hurricane [3] - 2078:2, 2078:4, 2078:5 hurricanes [2] - 2067:9, 2077:22 hurt [1] - 2096:4 hydrogeologic [1] - 2033:11 Hydrogeologic [2] - 2036:18, 2037:5 hydrologic [28] - 1933:1, 1933:4, 1933:5, 1933:10, 1934:16, 1934:22, 1935:4, 1938:1, 1941:14, 1941:20, 1959:11, 1970:8, 1970:9, 1970:14, 1970:19, 1970:25, 1980:24, 1981:2, 1986:8, 1993:18, 2002:6, 2012:14, 2037:21, 2037:24, 2039:5, 2050:10, 2091:25, 2096:20 hydrological [13] -

- Mason & Lockhart -. age 210 . to 210 . o. 2102
| 1934:8, 1951:22, | impact [78] - 1929:15, | 2125:1 | 2064:14, 2065:10 | infer [1] - 2012:12 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1973:25, 1988:4, | 1930:23, 1931:3, | important [8] - | incorrect [1] - 2095:3 | inference [1] - |
| 1993:14, 2063:25, | 1935:9, 1935:20, | 2007:11, 2053:23, | increase [14] - 1931:8, | 1981:18 |
| 2064:13, 2064:18, | 1936:11, 1936:13, | 2059:3, 2059:9, | 1938:9, 1938:21, | inferior [1] - 2093:19 |
| 2064:24, 2065:1, | 1936:24, 1937:15, | 2059:10, 2086:15, | 1984:6, 1984:23, | infiltration [2] - |
| 2065:9, 2082:3, | 1940:18, 1946:10, | 2091:21. 2144:10 | 1985:9, 1998:19, | 2068:18, 2074:16 |
| 2082:7 | 1960:22, 1965:23, | impose [5] - 2122:8. | 1998:23, 2056:17. | inflection [4] - 1944.8 |
| hydrologically [5] - | 1974:14, 1974:19, | 2122:16, 2123:1 | 2057:22, 2062:1 | 1958·16 1992·7 |
| 2064:17. 2073:24. | 1986:25, 1987:4. | 2123.2.2123.6 | 2093:10, 2117:3 | 2026:15 |
| 2074:2. 2086:6. | 1987:23, 1988:7. | imposed (6) - | 2117:7 | inflow (5) - 1030.24 |
| 2099:3 | 1988:11, 1989:6 | 1932·21 1933·1 | increased [13] - | 10/0·/ 10/0·10 |
| hydrologist [6] - | 1995:18, 2006:15 | 1967:14 2123:10 | 1936-21 1937-3 | 10/1:1 1050:/ |
| 2011.2 2041.8 | 2015:16, 2015:20 | 2125.21 2126.3 | 1939:15 1940:10 | 1941.1, 1930.4 |
| 2068:2 2071:10 | 2016:6 2016:9 | impossible [4] - | 10/1:23 10/2:5 | inflowe [1] - 1940.17 |
| 2084.9 2109.3 | 2017:1 2018:10 | 10/0.13 | 1040.2 1040.14 | 1000:05 4040:4 |
| bydrologist's [4] | 2017:1, 2010:10, | impoundment (5) | 1949.2, 1949.14, | 1936:25, 1942:4 |
| 2010:4 | 2022.22, 2023.0, | | 1903.14, 2020.14, | Influence [2] - |
| 2010.4 | 2023:25, 2023:10, | 2018:21, 2019:22, | 2037.22, 2030.23, | 1989:12, 1995:10 |
| | 2023.23, 2024.3, | 2020:8, 2020:17, | 2105.7 | information [12] - |
| 2043.2, 2058.7, | 2024.14, 2020.7, | 2021:5 | Increases [11] - | 1939:8, 2034:23, |
| 2078:16, 2135:2 | 2020.10, 2020.13, | impounaments [9] - | 1929:15, 1936:13, | 2035:2, 2056:25, |
| nyarology [13] - | 2027.15,2027.21, | 1969:12, 1969:24, | 1937:19, 1940:25, | 2057:24, 2077:20, |
| 2002:9, 2003:9, | 2027:23, 2028:9, | 2018:20, 2019:1, | 1960:16, 1963:8, | 2086:20, 2094:2, |
| 2027:1, 2041:8, | 2030:2, 2030:6, | 2019:12, 2019:21, | 1963:19, 1972:9, | 2094:7, 2130:8, |
| 2041:11, 2042:25, | 2030:17, 2030:22, | 2020:11, 2020:14, | 2016:4, 2016:6, | 2131:4 |
| 2069:18, 2069:20, | 2031:1, 2031:8, | 2020:22 | 2067:18 | input [8] - 1930:11, |
| 2070:10, 2075:5, | 2031:16, 2032:2, | impressions [1] - | incremental [2] - | 1945:5, 1988:9, |
| 2085:24, 2086:1, | 2032:12, 2032:18, | 2056:15 | 2019:20, 2020:6 | 2060:8, 2080:25, |
| 2096:15 | 2032:20, 2032:21, | improvement [1] - | indeed [2] - 2077:24, | 2094:14, 2118:13, |
| | 2033:1, 2033:6, | 2035:15 | 2116:18 | 2131:3 |
| | 2033:10, 2037:1, | improvements [1] - | independent [3] - | input-output [1] - |
| i e m 2004:15 | 2050:6, 2051:8, | 2139:2 | 2014:13, 2019:10, | 2094:14 |
| 1.e [2] - 2004.15, | 2067:15, 2069:11, | IN [1] - 2149:10 | 2074:19 | inputs [2] - 1988:9, |
| 2082.8 | 2085:24, 2086:1, | inadvertently [2] - | independently [6] - | 2015:13 |
| IBI [2] - 1931:21, | 2110:3, 2110:9, | 1956:9, 1957:6 | 2014:10, 2014:17, | insignificant [5] - |
| 1931:25 | 2118:3, 2118:25, | Inc [1] - 2036:18 | 2024:3, 2026:18, | 2017:2, 2017:23, |
| Ich [1] - 1968:9 | 2119:10, 2119:22, | inches [2] - 2061:9, | 2026:23, 2068:25 | 2018:4. 2018:11. |
| Ichawaynochaway [4] | 2121:15, 2121:19, | 2063:6 | index [4] - 1951:21, | 2018:15 |
| - 1967:22, 1968:7, | 2132:21, 2134:1, | include [11] - 1958:18. | 1952:3, 1952:9, | inspect [1] - 2137:7 |
| 1968:14, 1968:20 | 2134:9, 2134:21, | 1978:14, 1978:25, | 2065:25 | instance [1] - 2131:25 |
| idea [3] - 2130:12, | 2144:18 | 1998.4 1998.9 | INDEX [1] - 1926:1 | instead [7] - 1954.2 |
| 2130:14, 2141:3 | impacting [6] - | 2000:2. 2004:22. | indicate [2] - 1949:18, | 1954·14 1978·24 |
| identified [7] - | 2055:10, 2132:14, | 2009:5, 2019:4 | 2076:21 | 2009:25 2021.9 |
| 1938:10, 1939:6, | 2133:22, 2134:18, | 2075:15, 2113:11 | indicated [3] - | 2022:4 2026:5 |
| 2003:1, 2005:7, | 2144:19 | included 181 - | 1949:24. 2055:2. | integrated [1] - |
| 2057:14, 2127:3, | impacts [12] - | 1933:21, 1936:16 | 2057:7 | 1946.23 |
| 2141:11 | 1970:14, 1970:21, | 1940:18, 1941.12 | indicates [1] - 2048:9 | intense 141 - 2047-3 |
| identify [7] - 1971:22, | 1981:3, 1981:15, | 1998:11, 2012:10 | indicating [3] - | intense [1] - 2047.0 |
| 1972:8, 1973:17, | 2018:9, 2053:20, | 2127.23 2132.24 | 1953.10 2048.17 | interaction (4) |
| 1974:8, 1980:15, | 2071:14, 2082:6, | includes [4] - 1932-4 | 2061:24 | 10/0:11 1007.7 |
| 1996:2, 2141:13 | 2118:10, 2118:14, | 1932.10 1932.15 | indication [1] - | 1949.11, 1907.7, |
| illustrate [2] - 2072:8, | 2118:16, 2120:19 | 1939.23 | 2012.14 | 1907.12,2024.7 |
| 2072:12 | implementation [1] - | including [2] = 1076.1 | indicator Int - | 1022:16 1060:12 |
| illustrative [1] - | 2128:1 | 1070·2 | 1088.10 1080.5 | 1932:10, 1969:13 |
| 2099:4 | implemented [1] - | inconconucrticly | 1080.10, 1909.0, | Interest [1] - 2132:21 |
| imagery [3] - 2019:25, | 2123:16 | 1099-2 | 1303.14, 2011.4,
2070-5 2000-14 | Interested [4] - |
| 2020:22, 2141:10 | implementing [1] - | | 2079.0, 2009.14 | 2076:8, 2076:10, |
| immaterial [1] - | 2129:12 | | | 2078:11, 2127:20 |
| 2017:24 | importance 151 - | 2082:12 | 1101VIUUAI [5] - | interesting [1] - |
| immediately [1] - | 2046:5. 2046.23 | incorporated [1] - | Z I 10. 10, Z IZU:25, | 2081:18 |
| 1991:14 | 2048:11. 2065:4 | 20/8:22 | 2122:18, 2137:4, | interests [1] - 1948:14 |
| | TH | E REPORTING G | KOUF:a | interim [1] - 1964:16 |

73 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart.

The Reporting Group (207) 797-6040

Interior (0.040.10	2120.10 2120.12	1007-11 2022-E	2120-2	2052.15 2052.25
Interior [1] - 2043: 19	2139.10, 2139.12, 2140:2, 2141:2	1997:11, 2032:5,	2129:3	2052:15, 2052:25,
Internet [1] - 2048:2	2140.3, 2141.3,	2094.7, 2111.0	lag [1] - 2140.0	2000.10, 2000.21,
Interpolate [1] -	2 4 . 2, 2 4 .25	June [27] - 1940:1,	Lake [86] - 1929:24,	2056.1, 2090.25,
2063:17		1941:2, 1941:8,	1942:19, 1943:21,	2091:8, 2092:5,
Interpretation [4] -	2138:18, 2139:4,	1942:6, 1957:22,	1943:25, 1944:4,	2096:24, 2099:11,
1994:25, 1995:23,	2140:9, 2145:8	1958:3, 1959:25,	1944:12, 1944:24,	2099:21, 2100:8,
2083:20, 2083:21	ISSUE [2] - 2049:6,	1977:23, 1978:7,	1945:2, 1945:3,	2100:19, 2101:2,
interrupt [1] - 2121:20	2121:3	1983:21, 1984:4,	1945:6, 1945:13,	2101:11, 2102:3,
interstate [1] - 2085:9	Issued [3] - 1946:11,	1984:7, 2031:13,	1947:3, 1947:5,	2102:6, 2102:16,
introduce [3] -	2121:5, 2122:22	2031:21, 2061:6,	1947:8, 1947:18,	2102:20, 2102:22,
1928:22, 1928:24,	issues [5] - 2013:17,	2061:7, 2061:17,	1949:10, 1949:13,	2103:11, 2103:19,
2145:13	2028:16, 2041:12,	2064:19, 2072:19,	1950:2, 1950:9,	2104:1, 2104:19,
introducing [1] -	2110:12, 2136:21	2073:13, 2100:24,	1950:13, 1950:25,	2104:22, 2105:10,
2052:23	issuing [1] - 2128:5	2102:13, 2103:24,	1951:7, 1953:6,	2105:14, 2105:16,
inundated [1] - 2088:1	itself [7] - 1930:9,	2108:5, 2111:6,	1953:9, 1953:16,	2105:21, 2106:1,
invested [1] - 2145:5	1936:5, 1981:24,	2113:6, 2149:17	1953:20, 1954:1,	2107:4, 2107:14,
investigate [1] -	1991:21, 2041:19,	jurisdiction [1] -	1954:4, 1954:9,	2108:9, 2108:12,
2042:24	2096:6, 2146:10	2124:19	1954:10, 1954:13,	2111:10, 2115:5,
investigation [2] -		JX [2] - 1957:14,	1954:15, 1954:19,	2145:10, 2145:19,
2139:13, 2145:7	J	1977:3	1954:24, 1955:25,	2140:1, 2140:11,
invite [7] - 2060:20,	lackson [10] -	JX-124 [5] - 1926:10,	1956:22, 1958:20,	2140:14, 2146:21,
2083:14, 2084:4,	211/-22 2115-22	1945:19, 1946:3,	1959:17, 1960:4,	2146:25, 2147:6,
2090:8, 2090:21,	2114.22, 2110.20, 2115.24 2116.2	1947:22, 1948:5	1960:13, 1960:15,	2147:8, 2147:12,
2095:10, 2095:18	2115.24, 2116.3,	JX-158 [2] - 1926:11,	1960:22, 1961:5,	2147:16, 2148:1,
involve [1] - 2038:16	2110.9, 2110.19,	1957:14	1961:6, 1961:7,	2148:5, 2148:20
involved [8] - 1937:4,	2110.22, 2130.24, 2142:7, 2142:11	JX-21 [2] - 1926:9,	1961:8, 1961:12,	land [1] - 2059:13
1967:20, 1968:5,	2142.7, 2143.11	2079:17	1961:18, 1961:19,	landings [1] - 2143:9
1968:11, 1968:18,	JAIVIE [1] - 1925.17	JX-54 [2] - 1926:10,	1962:1, 1962:6,	Langseth [36] -
1969:10, 2008:6,	January [1] - 1970:18	2003:15	1962:8, 1962:11,	2022:16, 2024:24,
2034:13	Jaramilio [3] -	JX-6 [1] - 1926:9	1962:19, 1962:22,	2025:8, 2025:12,
involvina [1] -	2008.21, 2074.18,		1963:3, 1963:7,	2025:22. 2025:25.
.	2074.10			
1947:19	2074:19	К	1963:11, 1963:18,	2026:6, 2026:11,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25	K	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22,	K keep [8] - 2058:10,	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:14	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:10	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeping [1] - 2059:6	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 keep [1] - 2069:10	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:9, 2050:10, 2	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2079:0, 2130:16,	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2130:24, 2131:25,	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2050:9, 21.0140.7	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] -	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] -
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] -	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2024:21, 2024:	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] -	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16,	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14,	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1929:1, 1929:5, 1929:9,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 2020:25, 20	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 4075:42, 4072, 2	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigate [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2025:4, 2023:41	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1969:23, 2016:14,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:8, 2035:11, 2025:4, 2025:20	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 L	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1976:5, 1976:21,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2035:18, 2036:2, 2036:24, 2026:2,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:14, 2035:22, 2025:14, 2035:22, 2025:24, 2025:35, 2025:24, 2025:35, 2025:24, 2025:35, 2025:24, 2025:35, 2025:24, 2025:35, 2025:24, 2025:35, 2025:24, 2025:25, 2025:24, 2025:25,	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 Lab [2] - 2138:19	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1977:2, 1977:6,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2036:5
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21, 2022:18, 2023:3.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:14, 2035:22, 2036:14, 2037:7	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 Lab [2] - 2138:19, 2140:9	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1977:2, 1977:6, 1985:16, 1985:22,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2035:18, 2036:2, 2036:5 language [1] -
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21, 2022:18, 2023:3, 2053:22, 2055:7,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:8, 2035:11, 2035:14, 2035:22, 2036:14, 2037:7 JOSHUA [1] - 1925:23	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 L Lab [2] - 2138:19, 2140:9 labeled [1] - 2005:1	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1976:5, 1976:21, 1977:2, 1977:6, 1986:3, 1999:24, 2052:92, 2003	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2036:5 language [1] - 1956:11
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21, 2022:18, 2023:3, 2053:22, 2055:7, 2117:12, 2117:18.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:8, 2035:11, 2035:14, 2037:7 JOSHUA [1] - 1925:23 journals [1] - 2068:25	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2066:23 kept [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 L Lab [2] - 2138:19, 2140:9 labeled [1] - 2005:1 labels [1] - 1956:8	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1977:2, 1977:6, 1985:16, 1985:22, 1986:3, 1999:24, 2013:23, 2040:8,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2035:18, 2036:2, 2036:5 language [1] - 1956:11 language [1] -
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21, 2022:18, 2023:3, 2053:22, 2055:7, 2117:12, 2117:18, 2119:1, 2119:10.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:14, 2035:22, 2036:14, 2037:7 JOSHUA [1] - 1925:23 journals [1] - 2068:25 judgment [1] -	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 L Lab [2] - 2138:19, 2140:9 labeled [1] - 2005:1 labels [1] - 1956:8 Labs [2] - 2139:4	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1976:5, 1976:21, 1977:2, 1977:6, 1985:16, 1985:22, 1986:3, 1999:24, 2013:23, 2040:8, 2040:11, 2040:17, 2040:24, 2040:2	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2035:18, 2036:2, 2036:5 language [1] - 1956:11 languages [1] - 2068:5
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21, 2022:18, 2023:3, 2053:22, 2055:7, 2117:12, 2117:18, 2119:1, 2119:10, 2120:15, 2121:1,	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:14, 2035:22, 2036:14, 2037:7 JOSHUA [1] - 1925:23 journals [1] - 2068:25 judgment [1] - 2013:17	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 Lab [2] - 2138:19, 2140:9 labeled [1] - 2005:1 labels [1] - 1956:8 Labs [2] - 2139:4, 2145:8	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1976:5, 1976:21, 1977:2, 1977:6, 1985:16, 1985:22, 1986:3, 1999:24, 2013:23, 2040:8, 2040:11, 2040:17, 2040:21, 2042:3,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2035:18, 2036:2, 2036:5 Language [1] - 2068:5 Lanier [2] - 1945:13,
1947:19 Iron [17] - 1971:4, 1986:12, 1986:18, 1988:2, 1988:6, 1990:15, 1990:19, 1990:25, 1991:14, 1992:6, 1992:11, 2044:19, 2052:2, 2052:5, 2052:6, 2053:9, 2055:6 irr [1] - 1931:24 irrigate [1] - 2022:21 irrigated [6] - 2047:4, 2114:21, 2116:2, 2116:9, 2116:23 Irrigated [1] - 2115:15 irrigation [30] - 1932:5, 1935:10, 1967:21, 1968:6, 1968:13, 1968:15, 1968:20, 1969:11, 1969:23, 2016:14, 2016:16, 2016:21, 2022:18, 2023:3, 2053:22, 2055:7, 2117:12, 2117:18, 2119:1, 2119:10, 2120:15, 2121:1, 2131:20, 2136:14.	2074:19 Jason [1] - 2106:25 Jim [6] - 1948:22, 1965:1, 1966:12, 1967:17, 1988:23, 2046:20 job [5] - 1953:17, 2077:14, 2137:6, 2138:20, 2138:25 join [1] - 2046:14 joint [2] - 1976:22, 2045:12 Joint [1] - 2135:20 Jon [1] - 2108:19 Jones [19] - 2024:9, 2024:13, 2024:15, 2024:21, 2024:25, 2025:4, 2025:8, 2029:15, 2029:22, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2031:11, 2035:14, 2035:22, 2036:14, 2037:7 JOSHUA [1] - 1925:23 journals [1] - 2068:25 judgment [1] - 2013:17 July [5] - 1940:1, THH	K keep [8] - 2058:10, 2058:12, 2060:9, 2070:13, 2070:14, 2070:15, 2070:19 keeping [1] - 2059:6 keeps [1] - 2069:10 kind [6] - 2050:9, 2079:9, 2130:16, 2130:24, 2131:25, 2132:1 kinds [3] - 2058:7, 2063:24, 2118:7 Kirkland [1] - 1928:23 knowledge [6] - 2034:14, 2034:16, 2118:24, 2122:14, 2136:18, 2140:15 Lab [2] - 2138:19, 2140:9 labeled [1] - 2005:1 labels [1] - 1956:8 Labs [2] - 2139:4, 2145:8 E REPORTING GI	1963:11, 1963:18, 1964:3, 1964:8, 1965:17, 1965:21, 1966:5, 1966:9, 1966:15, 1966:18, 1967:9, 1967:13, 1968:23, 1969:2, 1969:17, 1970:2, 1988:16, 1988:21, 1991:21, 1992:15, 2044:17, 2052:8, 2052:9, 2093:17, 2093:23, 2094:13, 2095:7, 2113:21 LANCASTER [80] - 1925:11, 1927:2, 1927:8, 1927:16, 1928:9, 1928:19, 1929:5, 1929:9, 1968:1, 1975:13, 1975:18, 1976:2, 1976:5, 1976:21, 1977:2, 1977:6, 1985:16, 1985:22, 1986:3, 1999:24, 2013:23, 2040:8, 2040:11, 2042:3, 2040:21, 2044:22, ROUP:25, 2013:23, 2040:8, 2040:21, 2044:22,	2026:6, 2026:11, 2026:13, 2026:19, 2026:24, 2027:1, 2028:19, 2028:24, 2029:4, 2029:12, 2029:15, 2029:21, 2029:25, 2030:5, 2030:9, 2030:17, 2030:25, 2031:7, 2031:20, 2032:6, 2032:17, 2032:19, 2032:25, 2033:5, 2034:5, 2035:19, 2036:8, 2036:16, 2036:23, 2037:4 Langseth's [13] - 2025:10, 2026:18, 2026:23, 2027:4, 2027:24, 2028:7, 2028:10, 2029:20, 2031:14, 2032:15, 2035:18, 2036:2, 2036:5 language [1] - 1956:11 languages [1] - 2068:5 Lanier [2] - 1945:13, 2113:22

				0000 10 0000 05
large [13] - 1945:12,	2051:14, 2053:15,	1984:6, 1984:8,	2009:4, 2011:3,	2092:12, 2099:25,
1948:10, 1972:13,	2054:13, 2054:16,	1984:12, 1984:13,	2011:5, 2011:6,	2100:16, 2101:7,
2007:1, 2042:23,	2061:18, 2077:10,	1984:17, 1984:23,	2011:13, 2013:1,	2101:24, 2112:19,
2043:1, 2050:12,	2089:14, 2089:15,	1985:9, 1989:4,	2021:17, 2021:23,	2113:9, 2115:10,
2051:8, 2056:17,	2116:17	1989:7, 1989:13,	2025:10, 2028:15,	2120:10, 2128:7,
2077:24, 2086:1,	Lettenmaier [6] -	1995:11, 1996:17,	2039:22, 2041:15,	2130:9, 2130:12,
2101:16, 2137:22	2059:19, 2065:19,	2009:13, 2009:16,	2041:20, 2050:4,	2130:13, 2136:21,
largely [1] - 2096:12	2066:3, 2068:16,	2015:17, 2016:7,	2050:19, 2051:1,	2141:18
larger [3] - 1979:6,	2074:15	2021:23, 2022:2,	2053:23, 2054:4,	looks [9] - 1931:19,
2061:18, 2077:16	letter [2] - 2013:14.	2025:12, 2038:23,	2056:12, 2057:19,	1939:22, 1940:7,
largest [1] - 1973:19	2129:2	2039:10, 2044:2,	2059:4, 2061:16,	1950:22, 1958:6.
last (10) - 1928:3	level [13] - 2002:7	2056:21, 2108:16.	2065:6. 2065:16.	1999:4. 2010:9.
1957:15 2045:25	2012.25 2044.11	2108:25, 2109:6	2067:20, 2067:21	2066 13 2096 19
2065:14 2072:16	2012:20, 2017:11,	2115.23 2120.12	2068:11 2069:24	lose [1] - 1972:17
2003.14, 2072.10,	2047.21, 2047.23,	2141.23	2070:3 2070:12	
2081.18, 2084.4,	2004.10, 2009.3,	lines 121 - 1953·4	2072:18 2076:22	
2106:23, 2145:5,	2071.18, 2071.23,	2003:4 2036:5	2072.10, 2070.22,	1000:1 1000:5
2147:2	2102.18, 2104.23,	2003.4, 2030.5	2070.23, 2000.12,	1990:1, 1990:5,
law [4] - 2124:16,	2144:15	LINSIEY [2] - 207 1.2,	2008.2, 2008.21,	1990:9, 1993:1,
2124:21, 2129:4,	levels [12] - 1937:24,	2071:10	2089:10, 2090:4,	2002:17, 2002:25,
2129:12	1939:15, 1960:23,	list [4] - 1970:24,	2090:12, 2097:23,	2003:4, 2004:20,
lawful [1] - 2144:10	1966:3, 1966:11,	2124:25, 2129:6,	2098:16, 2102:3,	2004:22, 2005:7,
lawns [1] - 2059:13	1971:17, 1994:16,	2148:14	2104:18, 2110:17,	2005:22
lawsuit [2] - 2109:14,	2089:4, 2094:8,	listed [5] - 2001:8,	2116:5, 2116:19,	loss [2] - 2019:11,
2109:18	2110:10, 2124:4,	2001:14, 2002:4,	2119:3, 2128:15,	2020:12
lawyers [1] - 2107:21	2136:14	2108:17, 2146:7	2134:25, 2136:5,	lost [1] - 2060:14
lavmen [1] - 2099:12	Lewis [4] - 1929:2,	lists [3] - 2116:22,	2137:12	low [66] - 1954:7,
lead [2] - 1940:25.	2109:1, 2109:3,	2124:22, 2133:11	looked [49] - 1931:6,	1971:2, 1971:21,
2062:23	2114:9	literally [1] - 1962:20	1932:19, 1933:21,	1971:23, 1971:24,
learn [1] - 2032:11	LEWIS [2] - 1925:21,	litigation [7] -	1935:17, 1936:11,	1973:12, 1974:1,
least [13] - 1980-1	1929:4	1943:22, 1949:1,	1939:20, 1948:4,	1974:3, 1974:5,
1001:6 2011:0	LFO [4] - 2089:25.	2007:21. 2007:24.	1953:19, 1954:7,	1974:8. 1974:20.
2011:17 2021:3	2090:22, 2091:12	2008:6. 2008:9.	1956:18, 1958:1,	1977:15, 1978:7.
2011.17, 2021.3,	life (3) - 1963:1	2034:13	1958:11, 1960:16,	1978:13, 1979:12,
2030.16, 2009.7,	1963:3 2101:14	lived [1] - 2101.14	1969:10, 1969:22,	1979:25, 1980:12
2009.0, 2093.12,	light 11 - 2045:1	Livneh M - 2062:15	1982:5, 1986:10,	1980.23 1981.14
2104.0, 2110.8,		2062.17 2062.18	1990:11. 1995:18.	1081.10 1087.1
2117:7, 2119:21	$limit_{(4)} = 2124.11$	2002.17, 2002.10,	1996:13, 2003:20,	1987.18 1987.22
leaves [1] - 2049:16		2002.22	2016:4. 2019:25.	1088.5 1001.22,
Lee [1] - 2143:5		load [1] - 2002.18	2034.20 2051.13	1900.3, 1991.23,
left [5] - 1983:22,	1950:9, 2063:14	local [1] - 1987:22	2054:8 2054:9	1992.10, 2000.12, 2020:2, 2050:2
2000:18, 2004:9,	limited [1] - 1990:15	location [1] - 2029:1	2057:20 2057:24	2059.5, 2050.2,
2105:4, 2105:7	limiting [1] - 2130:24	logs [1] - 2132:2	2060:21 2062:4	2051.19, 2051.20,
legal [5] - 2121:16,	limits [1] - 2118:18	long-term [1] -	2000.21, 2002.4,	2053:12, 2054:5,
2132:15, 2132:21,	line [65] - 1929:16,	2075:19	2002.3, 2002.0,	2054:9, 2057:18,
2133:22	1930:25, 1932:21,	long-winded [1] -	2003.23, 2000.10,	2061:8, 2064:12,
lengthy [1] - 1945:21	1933:24, 1934:7,	2148:3	2000.14, 2000.10,	2005:14, 2007:7,
LEOPOLD [12] -	1934:16, 1934:21,	look [80] - 1930:23,	2000.20, 2009.1,	2067:10, 2067:11,
2105:25, 2106:9,	1935:3, 1935:9,	1931:15, 1933:16,	2003.1, 2003.3,	2072:22, 2076:10,
2107:2, 2107:6,	1935:20, 1936:20,	1937:8, 1937:22,	2077.3, 2078.24,	2076:12, 2076:13,
2107:11, 2129:21,	1937:16, 1937:25,	1942:1, 1946:20,	2081:3, 2086:22,	2076:21, 2076:25,
2135:22, 2135:24,	1938:10, 1938:17,	1954:20, 1955:10,	2098:11, 2103:3,	2077:4, 2077:9,
2140:22, 2141:1.	1939:5, 1940:13,	1958:24, 1960:10,	2116:14	2077:10, 2077:15,
2145:12. 2147:10	1941:15, 1941:24,	1965:16, 1971:2,	IOOKING [34] - 1952:8,	2078:3, 2078:10,
less [24] - 1941:7	1942:1, 1942:11,	1972:19, 1974:24,	1968:7, 1973:15,	2079:1, 2079:14,
1941 13, 1949 15	1943:14, 1949:8,	1975:12, 1978:9,	1974:21, 1977:9,	2080:16, 2080:19,
1966.6 1966.12	1960:24, 1965:24.	1982:4, 1982:12	1979:15, 2000:19,	2081:12, 2082:1,
1967.10 1967.17	1980:10, 1981:12.	1986:14, 1988:19.	2004:5, 2048:11,	2082:16, 2090:2,
1968.25 1060.19	1982:25 1983.1	1990:25 1991.7	2050:13, 2051:20,	2095:16, 2096:10,
1070.20, 1077.15	1983:2 1983:6	1994:4 1996:23	2060:2, 2062:9,	2100:5, 2100:21
1000.2 2012.0	1983:12 1983:14	1999:15 2001:18	2064:9, 2077:19,	low-flow [1] - 1954:7
1330.2, 2040.3, 2048-14 2040-10	1983:25 1984:2		DOITD:11, 2081:7,	Lower [3] - 2002:10,
2040.14, 2048.19,	1000.20, 100 4 .2 TH	S KEPOKTING G	1.00° :2, 2092:10,	,
	I	11	•	

2009.23, 2130.13
lower [12] - 1932:8,
1935:13, 1971:9,
2061:1, 2061:3,
2005.13, 2103.9,
2141:22, 2143:6
2143:7
lowering [2] - 2055:8,
2103:9
lowest [10] - 1966:18,
1969:6, 1999:20,
2000:3, 2049:4,
2051.5, 2054.10, 2076:24, 2088:23
2112:14
lowest-ever [1] -
2049:4
lunch [3] - 2040:24,
2042:16, 2043:4
M
ma'am [1] - 1929:9
magazine [1] -
2068:24
magnification [1] -
2081:24
magnified [4] -
2081:18, 2081:21,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] -
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:24
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maining (1) - 2051:25
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] -
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] -
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintaining [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15,
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [4] - 2019:24
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 manda [1]
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 man-made [1] - 2018:21
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 man-made [1] - 2018:21 manage [1] - 2139:2
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintaining [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 man-made [1] - 2018:21 manage [1] - 2139:2 managed [1] -
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 man-made [1] - 2018:21 managed [1] - 1946:21
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 main [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 man-made [1] - 2018:21 managed [1] - 1946:21 management [5] -
2082:6, 2082:7 magnitude [4] - 1938:8, 1940:9, 2067:24, 2072:12 mail [1] - 2146:19 main [1] - 2041:14 Maine [5] - 1925:13, 1925:15, 2101:14, 2104:5, 2149:3 mainstem [1] - 2126:21 maintain [1] - 2051:25 maintained [1] - 2085:5 maintaining [1] - 2084:19 major [4] - 1998:9, 2041:21, 2059:5, 2060:5 majority [2] - 1973:15, 2117:21 man [1] - 2018:21 man-made [1] - 2018:21 manage [1] - 2139:2 managed [1] - 1946:21 management [5] - 2124:17, 2124:21,

2145:6
Management [8] -
2107:25, 2108:23,
2123:15, 2125:11,
2128:2, 2129:11,
2130:4, 2138:16
mandatory [4] -
2123:7, 2123:16,
2123:21, 2123:24
manifest [1] - 2053:20
1931-16
manipulate [2] -
2014:20, 2014:22
manual [1] - 1946:13
manufacture [1] -
2039:12
map [8] - 1986:15,
1990:23, 1991:1,
1991:12, 2002:20,
2005:1, 2047:6,
2072:24
mapping [1] - 2141:14
marine [1] - 2143:8
Mason (4) 1025:14
2140.2 2140.15
2149:15
mass [1] - 2070:21
massive [1] - 2019:18
MASTER [80] -
1925:11, 1927:2,
1927:8, 1927:16,
1928:9, 1928:19,
1929:5, 1929:9,
1968:1, 1975:13,
1975:18, 1976:2,
1976:5, 1976:21, 1077:2, 1077:6
1977.2, 1977.0,
1985.10, 1985.22, 1986:3, 1999:24
2013:23, 2040:8
2040:11, 2040:17,
2040:21, 2042:3,
2042:12, 2044:22,
2044:25, 2045:3,
2052:15, 2052:25,
2055:18, 2055:21,
2056:1, 2090:25,
2091:8, 2092:5,
2090.24, 2099.11, 2000.21, 2100.8
2100.19 2101.2
2101:11, 2102:3.
2102:6, 2102:16,
2102:20, 2102:22,
2103:11, 2103:19,
2103:11, 2103:19, 2104:1, 2104:19,
2103:11, 2103:19, 2104:1, 2104:19, 2104:22, 2105:10,

2105:21, 2106:1,	
2107:4, 2107:14,	
2108:9, 2108:12,	
2111:16, 2115:5,	
2145:16, 2145:19,	
2140.1, 2140.11, 2146:14 2146:21	
2146:25, 2147:6,	
2147:8, 2147:12,	
2147:16, 2148:1,	
2148:5, 2148:20	
match [3] - 1953:7,	
2008:25, 2010:18 matched (4) 2008:23	
matching [1] - 2000.23	
material [2] - 2017:3,	
2018:10	
materialize [1] -	
1941:23	
materialized [1] -	
1940:13	
materialy [1] - 1993:5	
1975:25 1976:1	
math [1] - 1958:9	
mathematical [1] -	
2029:4	
mathematically [3] -	
1949:12, 1949:17,	
1950:3 matter m - 1925:10	
1928:14, 1944:1.	
2031:15, 2057:18,	
2057:19, 2076:15,	
2095:20, 2146:22	
maximum [4] -	
2072:20, 2092:16, 2132:4, 2132:6	
McDowell [10] -	
2033:22, 2033:24,	
2034:2, 2034:6,	
2034:9, 2034:11,	
2034:14, 2035:16,	
2036:13, 2036:19	
1977-10 1978-25	
1979:21, 1990:11,	
2019:15, 2027:16,	
2038:10, 2039:1,	
2043:9, 2056:8,	
2061:20, 2062:4,	
2068:1, 2079:3,	
2073.4, 2004.9, 2084:23, 2085:21	
2087:22, 2092:10.	
2100:17, 2119:14,	
2121:20, 2133:5,	
2133:15, 2143:2	
meaning [6] -	~
REPORTING	G

1977:15, 2012:2, 2022:25, 2051:10 meaningful [1] -2119:21 means [13] - 1945:9, 1952:14. 1962:7. 1962:9, 1989:24, 1990:5, 1992:9, 2009:25, 2010:12, 2056:10, 2061:22, 2084:10, 2132:19 measure [6] -2047:20, 2066:1, 2102:7, 2102:9, 2102:10, 2119:7 measured [2] -1992:2, 2095:6 measurement [4] -2043:11, 2063:3, 2063:6, 2063:8 measurements [8] -1949:21, 2043:8, 2047:16, 2063:9, 2063:14, 2101:22, 2102:12, 2103:17 measures [3] -2083:12, 2089:21, 2098:1 measuring [3] -2102:24, 2103:14, 2137:20 meet [5] - 1978:13, 1979:11, 2121:5, 2132:4, 2132:6 meets [1] - 2121:1 members [1] -2127:23 memo [23] - 2031:21, 2031:23, 2032:1, 2109:6, 2109:11, 2109:17, 2110:3, 2110:8, 2110:11, 2110:13, 2110:14, 2110:16, 2127:12, 2127:19, 2127:25, 2128:18, 2145:23, 2145:24, 2146:2, 2146:9, 2146:12, 2147:3 Memo [1] - 2127:8 memorandum [3] -1997:11, 2109:20, 2127:9 memory [4] - 2071:4, 2079:16, 2079:23, 2109:23 mention [4] - 2032:1, 2032:12, 2032:18, 2062:24 ROUP oned [23] -

2031:1, 2031:7, 2031:12, 2043:17, 2043:22, 2045:24, 2046:3, 2046:22, 2047:17, 2058:19, 2069:12, 2070:6, 2071:7. 2074:18. 2075:9, 2079:1, 2079:8, 2104:5, 2109:11, 2125:14, 2125:17, 2131:9, 2140:2 met [1] - 2092:24 meteorological [9] -1974:2, 2059:25, 2063:25, 2064:4, 2064:8, 2064:10, 2064:22, 2065:6, 2082:4 meter [1] - 2047:19 method [1] - 2068:3 methodologies [1] -2068:7 methodology [3] -2068:3, 2069:20, 2070:18 metric [7] - 1954:6, 1974:16, 1974:21, 1974:23, 2077:1, 2079:1, 2079:4 metrics [5] - 1953:19, 1954:20, 1972:14, 2079:8, 2083:12 **MFL** [6] - 2124:9, 2126:11, 2144:1, 2144:7, 2144:12, 2144:13 MFL's [14] - 2124:11, 2124:17, 2124:23, 2125:8, 2125:12, 2128:1, 2128:5, 2128:11, 2128:12, 2129:3, 2129:6, 2129:12, 2143:22, 2144:3 microphone [2] -1928:1, 2106:21 mid [2] - 1984:4, 1984:7 mid-June [2] - 1984:4, 1984:7 middle [2] - 1984:15, 1996:25 might [14] - 1993:10, 1996:20, 2039:19, 2040:5, 2049:5, 2055:5, 2074:6, 2099:17, 2110:4, 2110:9, 2110:17, 2115:3, 2147:3,

2147:18 million [ȝ] - 2119:17, 2142:21, 2142:22	1952:1, 1952:10, 1953:6, 1953:9, 1953:10, 1953:12,	2034:9, 2034:14, 2034:22, 2035:6, 2035:8, 2035:9,	2016:2, 2025:6, 2033:11, 2033:20, 2042:20, 2042:22,	2121:8, 2121:11 morning [27] - 1927:2, 1927:4, 1927:5,
mind [1] - 2119:20	1953:16, 1953:18,	2035:12, 2035:15,	2060:5, 2060:8,	1927:9, 1927:12,
minimal [2] - 2006:14,	1953:21, 1954:2,	2035:16, 2035:23,	2062:13, 2069:3,	1928:18, 1928:19,
2124:4	1954:4, 1954:9, 1054:10, 1054:14	2036:10, 2036:14,	2078:14, 2130:22	1929:4, 1929:5,
1024:0 1025:12	1954.10, 1954.14, 1954:15, 1954:16	2030.17, 2030.23, 2036:24, 2037:5	2010:17 2067:23	1929.12, 1929.13, 1976:1-2040:9
1954.2, 1955.15, 1964:19, 1964:23	1954:17, 1954:20,	2037:7, 2060:9	models (32) - 1929:22	2040:11 2040:13
1965:7, 1965:9,	1954:24, 1956:1,	2066:17, 2066:23,	1951:22, 1952:8,	2044:18, 2052:8,
1965:14, 2038:23,	1956:2, 1956:20,	2067:6, 2067:13,	1954:8, 1954:21,	2055:2, 2060:6,
2039:9, 2087:6,	1956:22, 1956:24,	2068:14, 2068:17,	2007:12, 2008:16,	2060:23, 2066:18,
2087:7, 2094:11,	1957:2, 1958:19,	2068:18, 2069:16,	2025:5, 2026:3,	2076:1, 2091:24,
2094:23, 2096:8	1958:21, 1959:16,	2069:21, 2069:24,	2026:5, 2029:5,	2093:15, 2098:11,
minute [4] - 2003:22,	1959:18, 1960:3,	2070:2, 2070:8,	2029:9, 2029:13,	2098:13, 2147:23
2050:16, 2074:7,	1960.4, 1960.12, 1960:13, 1960:15	2070.9, 2070.16, 2071:6-2071:12	2029:21, 2035:20,	most[8] - 1983.7, 1007:20, 2010:17
2099.23 mischaracterizing 141	1960:16, 1960:18,	2071:13, 2074:17.	2036:9, 2036:12	2046:24 2060:2
- 1967·25	1960:21, 1960:22,	2076:5, 2076:7,	2036:20, 2066:16.	2067:7. 2104:16.
misconception [1] -	1961:6, 1961:8,	2077:6, 2077:11,	2066:19, 2069:4,	2114:21
2144:3	1961:10, 1961:14,	2077:12, 2078:2,	2069:5, 2070:3,	mostly [2] - 2142:12,
mistake [2] - 1957:6,	1961:15, 1961:16,	2078:3, 2078:4,	2070:24, 2071:1,	2142:14
2137:20	1961:18, 1961:21,	2078:19, 2078:21,	2075:6, 2075:7,	mountains [1] -
mistaken [1] - 2080:25	1961:22, 1962:2,	2093:17, 2093:19,	2093:16, 2118:7	2046:11
misunderstood [1] -	1962:3, 1962:6,	2093:23, 2093:24,	moderate [1] -	mouthful [1] - 2131:21
2041:3	1902.11, 1902.10, 1962:18, 1962:19	2094.13, 2094.14, 2094.18, 2095.2	1994.16	move [5] - 1970:6,
Mobile [4] - 2138:18,	1963:7. 1963:11.	2095:5. 2095:7.	2079-16	2130:21, 2142:12, 2143:2, 2143:4
2139.4, 2140.8, 2145.8	1963:18, 1963:20,	2098:2, 2098:17,	modern [4] - 2065:17.	moving [3] - 2138:14.
2143.0 Model (1) - 2071:3	1963:24, 1964:3,	2098:24, 2099:5,	2066:7, 2066:10,	2139:17, 2139:22
model [260] - 1929:23.	1964:8, 1965:18,	2118:2, 2118:6,	2089:17	MR [98] - 1927:5,
1929:24, 1930:2,	1965:21, 1965:22,	2118:9, 2118:13,	modification [1] -	1927:9, 1927:17,
1930:3, 1930:8,	1966:5, 1966:9,	2118:21, 2119:15,	2038:18	1928:6, 1928:10,
1930:9, 1930:11,	1966:15, 1966:19,	2131:9, 2131:20,	modifications [1] -	1928:12, 1967:24,
1930:12, 1930:15,	1907.9, 1907.13, 1968:11 1968:23	2133.0, 2133.9	1930:7	1975:24, 1976:3,
1930:18, 1930:20,	1969:2. 1969:6.	1932:15, 1933:20.	2126:24	2025:2, 2040:9,
1930:22, 1931:3,	1969:17, 1970:2,	1935:22, 1937:4,	2120.24 Monday 131 - 2147.23	2040.12, 2040.19, 2040.23, 2041.1
1931.10, 1931.17, 1032:24 1034:4	1987:3, 2006:3,	1954:3, 1962:5,	2148.17 2148.23	2040:23, 2041:1,
1934:5 1934:10	2006:8, 2006:13,	1965:17, 1966:2,	monitor [1] - 2136:23	2042:5, 2042:10,
1934:12, 1934:19,	2006:18, 2007:2,	1966:24, 1967:20,	monitoring [1] -	2042:14, 2042:18,
1934:25, 1935:16,	2007:3, 2007:7,	1968:5, 1968:15,	2048:1	2044:24, 2045:10,
1936:8, 1936:13,	2007:8, 2007:17,	1968:18, 2006:22,	monitors [1] - 2136:25	2045:15, 2045:20,
1936:24, 1941:12,	2007.16, 2007.20, 2007:23, 2007:25	2008.21, 2009.1, 2009.1	month [2] - 2048:19,	2045:23, 2046:2,
1941:17, 1942:7,	2008:2, 2008:10	2010:21 2010:23	2103:15	2052:12, 2052:19,
1942:10, 1942:13, 1042:14, 1042:15	2009:9, 2009:14,	2011:10, 2011:16,	monthly [5] - 1982:14,	2053.1, 2053.5, 2055:16, 2055:20
1942.14, 1942.15, 1942:19, 1942:20	2012:10, 2012:11,	2011:19, 2012:3,	1982.19, 2049.1, 2051:15, 2111:21	2055:23, 2056:2,
1943:21, 1943:25,	2012:21, 2012:23,	2012:5, 2012:18,	months (21) - 1935 19	2056:5, 2079:18,
1944:5, 1944:7,	2015:24, 2016:1,	2012:23, 2098:6,	1967:7, 1967:16,	2079:24, 2082:18,
1944:13, 1944:18,	2024:4, 2024:9,	2098:14, 2098:20,	1982:9, 2048:9,	2082:20, 2086:18,
1944:21, 1944:24,	2024:14, 2024:16,	2098:23, 2099:2	2048:13, 2048:18,	2086:19, 2088:12,
1945:2, 1947:3,	2024.22, 2024.25, 2025:4, 2025:9	1020.20 1032.4	2048:23, 2048:25,	2090:5, 2090:7,
1947:8, 1947:18,	2025:18. 2025:23.	1933:14, 1935:8	2050:3, 2050:14,	2091.2, 2091.5, 2001.11
1949:10, 1949:13, 1050:3, 1050:0	2026:1, 2029:16,	1935:24, 1937:9,	2051:3, 2051:18,	2091.9, 2091.11, 2091.21 2092.7
1950.3, 1950.9, 1950:13, 1950:10	2029:22, 2029:25,	1937:14, 1937:23,	2009.0, 2093.11, 2101.24 2108.3	2092:8, 2095:12.
1950:23. 1951:1.	2030:1, 2030:6,	1940:24, 1941:11,	2111:8. 2112:23	2095:14, 2096:23,
1951:4, 1951:7,	2030:9, 2033:16,	1941:19, 1947:24,	2113:2	2099:9, 2105:12,
1951:8, 1951:23,	2033:22, 2033:2 ⁴	E REPORTING G	ROUP orium [2] -	2105:19, 2105:25,
	2034:2, 2034:0,			

2106:9, 2107:2,	2088:8	2025:22, 2030:25,	2149:2	2117:5, 2117:6,
2107:6, 2107:11,	must [5] - 1948:15,	2031:7, 2032:9,	notation [1] - 2010:10	2142:24
2107:13, 2107:17,	1983:13, 2037:23,	2034:2, 2034:5,	note [2] - 1983:5,	numerical [3] -
2108:8, 2108:10,	2061:23, 2072:2	2051:4, 2063:18,	2143:12	1951:15, 2026:3,
2108:13, 2108:15,	mystery [1] - 2146:6	2087:10, 2089:15,	Noted [7] - 1985:25,	2118:18
2111:15, 2111:17,		2098:6, 2098:20,	1986:2, 2042:7,	numerous [2] -
2115:4, 2115:6,	Ν	2099:13, 2101:15,	2042:9, 2105:22,	2029:8, 2055:1
2115:9, 2115:11,	namo 101 1029-2	2144:12	2105:24, 2148:22	nutrient [1] - 2139:25
2120:2, 2120:3,	1029-2 1029-4	nevertheless [3] -	notes [3] - 2032:7,	
2120:6, 2120:8,	1920.3, 1920.4, 2106:22 2106:23	2050:25, 2064:24,	2032:11, 2149:5	0
2126:25, 2127:1,	2100.22, 2100.23,	2118:20	nothing [11] -	
2127:4, 2127:7,	2100.24, 2107.20,	New [1] - 1928:23	1927:23, 1961:11,	1025-19
2129:21, 2135:22,	2100.10, 2100.25	new [10] - 1928:25,	2038:18, 2040:6,	1925.10
2135:24, 2140:22,	nameo (/) - 2149.9	1943:21, 1974:24,	2099:8, 2099:9,	O Connor [1] -
2141:1, 2145:12,	names [1] - 2008.22	1985:12, 2016:21,	2105:11, 2105:12,	2002.23
2145:17, 2146:23,	narrow [1] - 2018:14	2035:6, 2035:8,	2106:18, 2111:13,	Oath [1] - 1943:9
2147:1, 2147:7,	Nash [1] - 1951:20	2111:13, 2121:8,	2147:10	object [1] - 1967:24
2147:10, 2147:15,	Nash-Sutcliffe [1] -	2121:25	notice [1] - 2050:21	objection [2] - 2025:2,
2147:17, 2148:3,	1951:20	newer [1] - 2036:9	notices [1] - 2138:7	2091:15
2148:19	National [1] - 2059:21	next [17] - 1948:19,	notion [1] - 2046:6	ODJECTIVE [4] -
MS [63] - 1927:4,	natural [14] - 2002:9,	1976:20, 1985:15,	November [9] -	2062:14, 2062:21,
1928:18, 1928:20,	2003:9, 2041:9,	2004:15, 2005:17,	1925:13, 1983:7,	2092:3, 2096:19
1929:4, 1929:6,	2058:24, 2059:2,	2005:18, 2032:6,	1984:20, 1985:1,	objectively [1] -
1929:11, 1931:12,	2067:2, 2081:25,	2059:19, 2065:21,	1985:2, 1985:3,	2066:13
1931:14, 1933:17,	2086:2, 2086:25,	2088:10, 2112:13,	1985:7, 2049:3,	objectives [1] -
1933:19, 1942:23,	2105:3, 2105:5,	2112:14, 2129:9,	2148:24	1946:18
1943:1, 1943:17,	2121:17, 2132:15,	2140:24, 2147:23,	nozzle [1] - 2139:11	observation [1] -
1945:18, 1946:4,	2133:24	2148:9, 2148:11	NSE [10] - 1951:18,	1993:19
1947:11, 1947:14,	Nature [2] - 2083:8,	night [1] - 2032:5	1951:20, 1952:3,	observe [2] - 1972:11,
1951:11, 1951:13,	2143:16	nine [5] - 1938:4,	1952:6, 1953:6,	1973:17
1955:2, 1955:5,	nature [5] - 2064:7,	1942:7, 1959:11,	1953:21, 1956:1,	observed [29] -
1956:14, 1956:16,	2064:14, 2065:7,	1959:14, 1960:1	1956:24, 1959:20,	1950:10, 1950:23,
1959:2, 1959:6,	2101:23	nitty [1] - 2131:2	1960:6	1952:1, 1953:7,
1968:3, 1975:4,	near [4] - 2029:2,	nitty-gritty [1] -	Number [1] - 1926:8	1953:10, 1970:25,
1975:9, 1975:14,	2044:2, 2053:9,	2131:2	number [21] -	1983:14, 1988:5,
1975:21, 1976:6,	2100:6	NOAA [2] - 2062:19,	1966:17, 1972:22,	1990:19, 1994:19,
1976:25, 1977:3,	nearby [2] - 2130:13,	2063:5	1977:1, 1977:3,	2006:23, 2007:8,
1977:8, 1985:11,	2134:2	nobody [1] - 2078:9	1978:2, 1979:6,	2008:22, 2009:1,
1985:19, 1985:24,	necessarily [3] -	non [1] - 2071:22	2014:17, 2050:13,	2009:16, 2009:20,
1986:5, 1986:6,	1974:2, 2038:16,	non-Georgia [1] -	2056:19, 2056:22,	2010:18, 2010:22,
1999:22, 1999:25,	2119:14	2071:22	2057:17, 2057:18,	2010:24, 2011:10,
2000:1, 2004:4,	need [4] - 2026:22,	none [1] - 2114:3	2057:20, 2092:22,	2011:17, 2011:19,
2004:8, 2013:3,	2084:14, 2087:25,	nonetheless [1] -	2093:10, 2093:11,	2012:3, 2012:19,
2013:6, 2013:10,	2128:13	2119:8	2113:16, 2116:16,	2012:24, 2051:21,
2013:24, 2027:8,	needed [4] - 2015:5,	noon [2] - 2040:14,	2140:5, 2140:8,	2077:6, 2077:9,
2027:11, 2039:24,	2081:3, 2083:13,	2042:4	2147:1	2077:12
2040:2, 2040:6,	2109:7	noontime [1] -	numbered [3] -	obtain [1] - 2047:12
2045:2, 2045:7,	needs [7] - 1998:25,	2040:22	1975:11, 1976:24,	obvious [5] - 1970:14,
2045:13, 2045:22,	2037:14, 2037:17,	Norm [1] - 2071:2	1991:9	1970:21, 1981:15,
2052:17, 2091:14,	2037:19, 2038:3,	normal [2] - 2061:1,	numbers [23] -	1988:7, 2129:10
2096:25, 2097:2,	2078:10, 2083:20	2061:3	1958:23, 1976:23,	obviously [9] -
2099:7, 2105:11	network [1] - 2043:21	northern [2] -	1997:2, 1997:10,	1929:1, 2016:11,
multiple [3] - 2060:25,	never [30] - 1943:25,	2046:12, 2136:16	1997:12, 1997:17,	2018:7, 2062:5,
2069:6, 2075:6	1944:7, 1944:12,	Northwest [7] -	1997:21, 1997:24,	2062:7, 2078:9,
multiple-year [1] -	1961:22, 1965:2,	2107:24, 2108:22.	2006:22, 2026:6,	2142:5, 2144:21,
2060:25	1992:2, 1992:10,	2123:15, 2125:11.	2053:14, 2062:11,	2145:3
multiply [1] - 2116:16	2007:23, 2008:2,	2128:1. 2129:10	2073:6, 2075:2,	occasion [2] - 2054:4,
multiplying [1] -	2008:6, 2008:9,	2130:3	2075:11, 2075:18,	2056:12
2020:7	2024:3, 2024:6,	northwest [1] - 2130:6	2112:1, 2113:20,	occasions [1] -
mussels [2] - 2081:8,	2024:13, 2024:2 ⁻ _{THF}	E REPORTING G	ROUP :14, 2117:4,	2054:24

occur [4] - 1972:3,	2037:18, 2039:3,	1949:20, 1988:21,	1983:15, 2095:6	2060:16, 2080:5,
1973 17 2067 22	2039.15 2041.14	2093.25 2095.23	outflows 151 - 1966 6	2091:3. 2095:18
2103.8	2041:21 2045:12	2140:10	1067:10 1068:24	2007:18 2007:20
2103.8	2041.21, 2045.12,	2140.10	1907.10, 1908.24,	2097.18, 2097.20,
occurred [5] -	2047:5, 2047:10,	Operations [2] -	1969:18, 1970:3	2097:21, 2100:11,
1990:20, 2050:10,	2047:12, 2047:18,	1948:7, 1948:9	outline [1] - 2046:9	2100:12, 2101:2,
2077:22, 2089:15,	2049:5, 2049:21,	operations [7] -	outlined [1] - 2047:1	2101:5, 2106:5,
2103:7	2050:16, 2050:18,	1948:23, 1950:15,	output [3] - 1954:8,	2110:18, 2113:10,
occurrence [1] -	2052:9, 2052:19,	1963:13, 1964:23,	2067 23 2094 14	2114:25, 2115:8,
2056:19	2053.13 2054.1	2038-21 2039-8		2115 10 2115 22
2030.19	2054:21 2055:22	2030.21, 2039.0,		2120.5 2120.10
occurrences [2] -	2004.21, 2000.22,	2137.8	2025:7	2120.3, 2120.10,
2051:4, 2051:6	2055.24, 2056.2,	opined [1] - 1949:2	outside [5] - 1944:5,	2128:19, 2131:15,
Oceanic [1] - 2059:21	2056:22, 2059:4,	opinion [30] -	1996:20, 2008:9,	2133:3, 2133:5,
Ochlockonee [2] -	2059:19, 2063:12,	1931:11, 1950:13,	2101:16, 2128:7	2136:5, 2140:23,
2004:17. 2090:1	2063:22, 2063:24,	1964:3, 1965:5,	over-predicting [1] -	2140:24, 2147:2
	2065:16, 2066:1,	1965 8 1965 10	1952.11	Page [2] - 1926:8.
	2066:16 2067:13	1965.12 1970.13		2147.2
1940.11, 1964.10,	2068:24 2069:24	1070:20 1072:2		2147.2 nagos (4) 2140:4
1984:11, 1984:15,	2000.24, 2009.24,	1970.20, 1972.2,	2137:25	pages [1] - 2149.4
2010:1, 2049:2,	2071.13, 2071.21,	1974:17, 1989:1,	overall [6] - 1989:20,	pains [1] - 2058:4
2055:14, 2056:7,	2071:22, 2074:17,	1993:13, 1994:24,	1990:2, 1990:10,	Panday [7] - 2028:2,
2101:18, 2101:19,	2083:23, 2085:23,	1996:13, 2002:8,	1998:22, 2067:8,	2033:12, 2033:16,
2109:15	2087:5, 2087:7,	2014:23, 2033:5,	2073:20	2033:20, 2034:10,
OF [4] - 1925:1	2089:7, 2089:8,	2037:13, 2037:21,		2034:15. 2034:18
1025:3 1025:6	2090:19, 2091:6.	2037.24 2038.1	2062:15	naner 131 - 2033-11
1925.0, 1925.0,	2092.1 2092.13	2038:6 2057:25	2003.15	2068:20 2068:22
1925:9	2002:1, 2002:10,	2038.0, 2037.23,	overlapped [1] -	2000.20, 2000.23
offer [5] - 2013:25,	2095.12, 2094.15,	2073:4, 2073:5,	2062:8	paragrapn [21] -
2014:23, 2023:23,	2094:18, 2100:5,	2073:25, 2096:3,	overuse [1] - 2137:13	1948:19, 1955:25,
2037:9, 2140:11	2100:8, 2100:21,	2103:20	own [6] - 1928:15,	1982:18, 2002:13,
offering 191 - 1965:4.	2103:3, 2107:20,	opinions [16] -	1967 25 2091 6	2028:15, 2036:7,
1965.7 1965.10	2118:8, 2126:24,	1936:7, 1986:8,	2130.22 21/1.15	2036:25, 2084:5,
1065:12 1080:1	2132:17, 2133:12,	2013.14 2014.1	2130.22, 2141.13,	2095.22 2097.18
1903.12, 1909.1,	2136:9. 2142:8.	2014.6 2015.12	2143.10	2007:21 2007:24
2024.2, 2037.13,	2143.6 2146.23	2017:04 2022:14	ownership [1] -	2097.21, 2097.24,
2037:25, 2038:6	2147:22	2017.24, 2022.14,	2143:14	2117.11, 2128.16,
office [4] - 1928:24,	2147.22	2022:15, 2023:24,	oyster [1] - 2109:8	2128:20, 2128:22,
2128:23, 2137:12,	one-day [2] - 2087:5,	2024:2, 2026:1,		2131:18, 2133:6,
2148:9	2087:7	2037:9, 2037:18,	Р	2133:7, 2140:21,
official [1] - 2078:22	one-step-ahead [1] -	2086:13	•	2140:23
offs [1] - 2085:3	2094:18	opportunity [4] -	p.m [4] - 2042:9,	paragraphs [1] -
offset (1) - 1949.5	one-to-one [2] -	1928:21, 2042:15,	2105:22, 2105:24,	1946:20
offen (0) 2075:7	2022:22, 2023:5	2088:2, 2089:10	2148:22	parallel [1] - 1942.22
Olteri [6] - 2075.7,	one-way [1] - 2085-23	opposite $[1] = 2064:23$	nage [73] - 1937-12	parantical ra
2076:7, 2076:20,	ones [2] - 1958:1		10/3.13 10/6.15	
2079:4, 2079:13,	2002:2	orange [2] - 1962.25,	1046:16 1047:0	1931:24, 1931:25
2138:11	2003.2	1983:6	1940.10, 1947.9,	part [21] - 1929:21,
older [1] - 2034:22	opening [8] - 2045:17,	order [4] - 1936:23,	1948:5, 1952:25,	1931:10, 1946:11,
once [3] - 2050:7,	2045:25, 2052:10,	1999:19, 2061:18,	1953:1, 1953:5,	1968:17, 1972:13,
2140:12, 2140:18	2082:22, 2086:17,	2073:17	1955:1, 1955:10,	1991:22, 2007:1,
one 1971 - 1935.7	2088:11, 2088:19,	Original [1] - 1925:1	1955:13, 1957:15,	2016:13, 2027:1,
1044:4 1050:19	2088:20	original 77 - 1955:11	1959:1, 1972:19,	2042:23. 2055:7.
1944.4, 1950.18,	operate [2] - 1964:10.	1955:15 1956:17	1977:24, 1982:18,	2064.20 2071.22
1951:10, 1953:19,	2094:16	1059:12 1067:14	1986.13 1990.24	2118.17 2128.18
1954:1, 1954:6,	operated (a) 1045:6	1930.12, 1907.14,	1994.4 1996.24	2110.17, 2120.10,
1954:13, 1965:5,	Operated [2] - 1945.0,	1997:5, 2032:21	1006:25 1000:16	2139.9, 2141.23,
1966:1, 1978:18,	1946:22	originally [3] -	1990.25, 1999.10,	2143:4, 2143:11,
1982:5, 1988:9,	operates [5] -	1958:13, 1960:11,	1999:25, 2002:12,	2144:3, 2146:20
1989:2, 1990:15,	1949:19, 2039:2,	2019:7	2002:20, 2002:24,	partially [2] - 1992:23,
1991:6. 1993:18.	2095:1, 2095:9,	otherwise [2] -	2003:15, 2003:17,	2121:10
1994.9 1998.25	2096:7	1930:14, 2121:1	2003:18, 2003:19,	particular [13] -
1000.1 1000.20,	operating [6] -	outcome [1] - 2149.8	2005:17, 2009:7,	2046:3. 2046:4
1000.1, 1000.4,	1930 19 1964 10	Outflow [2] 1030-10	2009:8, 2013:2,	2046.23 2049.1
2012.21, 2010.13,	1064.13 1064.16	1040-17	2021:21, 2021:24	20-10.20, 20-10.1,
2018:7, 2018:16,	1007.10, 1007.10,	1940.17	,,	2001.10, 2002.11,
	2001.1 2001.5	A	2025:11 2027.7	2056 6 2050 45
2022:22, 2023:5,	2094:1, 2094:5	outflow [5] - 1940:20,	2025:11, 2027:7,	2056:6, 2059:15,
2022:22, 2023:5, 2027:17, 2033:14,	2094:1, 2094:5 operation [5] - THE	outflow [5] - 1940:20, E REPORTING GI	2025:11, 2027:7, :12, 2028:25, ROUP _4_2039:23	2056:6, 2059:15, 2067:6, 2067:11,

79 of 90 sheets

Mason & Lockhart

The Reporting Group (207) 797-6040

			0444.05	
2071:12, 2077:13,	2016:24, 2017:18,	2122:1, 2122:18,	2141:25	2112:7, 2128:4,
Z1Z7:Z1	2018:2, 2018:17,	2129:25, 2130:9,	pivots [1] - 2140:2	2130:19, 2131:1,
2044:6 2050:2	2027:10, 2027:19,	2130.20, 2131.23,	piace [13] - 1955:3,	2144:15
2044.0, 2050.2,	2027.23, 2030.7, 2030:10	2134.4, 2134.0, 2134.8, 2142.20	1970.8, 2038.4,	2049-22
2070.11, 2004.11	2030.10, 2030.19, 2030.20	normits $r_{01} = 2118.18$	2113.9, 2120.0, 2126:11 2120:14	2040.22 nointing 121 2000:10
21/6·10	2030.22, 2031.1,	2121.8 2131.24	2120.11, 2120.14, 2130:16, 2134:7	2060-11 2136-13
2140.19 nac (1) - 2056:3	2031.15 2032.2	2132.17 2135.8	2135:15, 2137:9	nointe 101 - 1071.20
pas [1] - 2000.0	2032:12, 2032:18.	2135:9, 2137:4	2142.10 2144.19	2043·7
passed [1] - 1949.7	2033:1, 2033:2,	2137:5, 2141:16	Plaintiff [1] - 1925:4	policy [3] - 2037:25
passes [1] - 1945:9	2033:10, 2037:1,	permitted [3] - 2119:4,	Plan [11] - 2078:17.	2127:15. 2144:9
past 191 - 1944:1.	2047:1, 2071:20,	2138:2, 2142:22	2079:15, 2080:1,	pond [1] - 1931:24
1974:19. 2008:2.	2117:6, 2119:19,	permittee [1] - 2138:1	2080:7, 2081:12,	ponds [1] - 1932:11
2035:2, 2043:12,	2132:9, 2135:3,	permitting [5] -	2082:25, 2089:25,	portion [14] - 2005:14,
2043:13, 2043:16,	2139:24, 2140:13	2079:12, 2121:2,	2090:1, 2090:22,	2005:20, 2031:17,
2048:3, 2103:7	perception [1] -	2130:3, 2134:1,	2091:12	2096:16, 2112:16,
pattern [4] - 2057:11,	2129:17	2138:14	plan [5] - 1964:16,	2114:22, 2117:13,
2128:5, 2128:16,	perfect [2] - 1952:3,	PERRY [5] - 1925:17,	2078:18, 2078:22,	2117:18, 2121:9,
2128:22	2070:3	2045:15, 2147:15,	2090:11, 2090:20	2122:1, 2136:24,
patterns [1] - 2057:13	perfectly [2] -	2147:17, 2148:3	planning [5] -	2140:4, 2142:19
patting [1] - 2078:23	1951:25, 2062:8	Perry [4] - 2045:24,	2093:24, 2122:5,	portions [1] - 2005:21
PAUL [1] - 1925:18	performance [2] -	2088:20, 2147:16,	2122:7, 2122:15,	Portland [2] -
Paul [2] - 1927:10,	1960:12, 2130:22	2148:2 Domedia en 0000:00	2144:14	1925:13, 2063:13
2088:14	1051:15 2029:20	Perry's [5] - 2082:22,	plant [3] - 2049:16,	position [1] - 2045:21
pause [1] - 2042:1	norbane 101 1058:25	2080.10, 2080.21,	2139:19, 2139:20	possibility [1] -
pay [1] - 2139:9	20/15-8 2052-2	2000.10, 2000.10	planting [1] - 2131.5	1950:4
PBIAS [10] - 1951:18,	2063:3 2072:16	2034.12 2133.23	2058-20	1052:18 1004:24
1952:9, 1952:14,	2078:5, 2082:16,	2004.12, 2100.20, 2149·8	2030.20 nlav 181 - 1943.15	1952.10, 1994.24, 1005:23, 2000:1
1952.17, 1955.0,	2090:9	personally 121 -	1946.25 1947.12	2030·10
1955.24, 1950.2,	period [40] - 1939:25,	2025:13, 2034:12	1948:12, 1959:3	nost 151 - 2000.9
1960:8	1942:12, 1955:18,	perspective [1] -	2013:4. 2027:9.	2067:14, 2067:15
neak (5) - 1967 6	1957:23, 1960:1,	2133:25	2039:25	2134:1
1967:16, 2017:9.	1974:24, 1974:25,	Ph.D [2] - 1926:3,	played [7] - 1943:16,	post-1955 [2] -
2067:9, 2073:14	1975:1, 1977:23,	2071:9	1947:13, 1955:4,	2011:24, 2012:17
peaks [1] - 2112:8	1983:1, 1998:8,	phase [1] - 2139:17	1959:5, 2013:5,	post-1970 [3] -
peanuts [1] - 2139:20	1998:20, 1998:24,	phenomenon [2] -	2027:10, 2040:1	1973:3, 1973:8,
pending [1] - 2013:22	1999:1, 2009:2,	1987:23, 2003:7	pleading [1] - 2095:11	1998:4
people [5] - 2068:15,	2009:21, 2010:15,	PHILIP [1] - 1925:17	plot [2] - 2056:6,	post-1970's [1] -
2068:23, 2080:23,	2010:16, 2010:20,	photograph [1] -	2057:1	1974:13
2083:10, 2086:4	2011.20, 2011.24, 2012.17	2045:19	plotted [2] - 1982:23,	post-1998 [1] -
per [4] - 2043:15,	2012.12, 2012.17,	photography [2] -	1982:25	2056:18
2047:24, 2054:11,	2066:7. 2067:15	2021:11, 2021:13	piug [1] - 2131:8	post-calibration [1] -
2119:18	2075:14. 2076:22.	phrase [1] - 2070.0	1021-25	2067:14
percent [63] - 1931:23,	2087:3, 2089:17,	phraseu [1] - 1954.16	nodium (1) - 1028-21	2067-115
1931.25, 1932.5,	2102:25, 2103:24,	2137-11	Point 11 - 1945.14	2007.10
1932.7, 1932.11, 1032:15 1033:22	2104:3, 2104:18,	nick rei - 1999·1	2110 [.] 4 2110 [.] 6	2134·1
1932.13, 1933.22, 1934·14 1940·18	2128:9	1999.7 1999.11	2110:10	posted [1] - 2059:20
1941:21, 1945:15	periodically [1] -	2051:12, 2051:16.	point [26] - 1961:19,	potential [2] -
1952:9. 1958:11.	2047:19	2085:25	1970:9, 1972:8,	2137:13, 2139:1
1958:17, 1967:21,	periods [6] - 1997:24,	picked [1] - 1999:4	1972:14, 1973:7,	potentially [1] -
1968:5, 1968:12,	1998:11, 1998:25,	picks [1] - 1999:1	1983:17, 1992:5,	2135:18
1968:15, 1968:19,	1999:4, 2039:19,	piece [2] - 1951:10,	1992:11, 2022:10,	power [2] - 1951:21,
1969:10, 1969:12,	2089:24	2072:10	2040:16, 2041:25,	2010:12
1969:13, 1969:15,	permission [2] -	pin [1] - 2044:12	2043:13, 2043:16,	practical [1] - 2038:19
1969:22, 1969:24,	1929:8, 2146:8	pipe [1] - 2044:7	2046:8, 2063:2,	practice [2] - 2139:8,
2000:6, 2000:24,	2121.3 2121.1,	pivot [6] - 2139:10,	2063:8, 2063:9,	2145:6
2001:5, 2001:12,	2121.0, 2121.0, 2121.11 2121.0,	2140:3. 2140:16.	2063:14, 2069:5,	pre [3] - 1974:12,
2001:19, 2002:1,	THE	S REPORTING G	KUUP :13, 2081:23,	2000:9, 2044:9

Mason & Lockhart

pre-1970 [3] - 1973:8, 1973:13, 1974:24 pre-970 [1] - 1973:3 pre-and-post [1] - 2000:9 pre-electronic [1] - 2044:9 preapplication [1] - 2130:10 preceded [1] - 2020:25 precipitation [14] - 1974:3, 1974:4, 1996:3, 1999:5, 2051:5, 2061:2, 2061:4, 2061:6, 2061:7, 2061:10, 2062:6, 2065:24, 2104:22, 2105:3	2051:7, 2061:14, 2119:7, 2144:8 prevalent [1] - 2104:13 previously [2] - 1949:24, 2029:21 previously- developed [1] - 2029:21 primarily [1] - 2078:2 PRIMIS [3] - 1925:20, 2105:19, 2148:19 Primis [1] - 1929:1 priorities [1] - 2124:25 priority [2] - 2124:22, 2129:5 private [1] - 2143:15 PRMS [27] - 2007:3, 2007:7, 2007:16,	2074:20, 2094:20, 2136:14, 2141:5 produces [2] - 1963:11, 2132:3 producing [1] - 2145:9 product [3] - 2062:12, 2062:13, 2062:23 Professor [1] - 2071:10 program [4] - 2043:21, 2138:19, 2140:7, 2140:9 programs [1] - 2145:4 prohibition [2] - 2121:22, 2121:24 project [1] - 1946:23 projected [5] - 1937:15, 1940:10,	2068:23, 2071:3 publishes [1] - 2057:8 puddles [1] - 2059:1 pull [8] - 1931:12, 1933:17, 1956:14, 1957:13, 1971:1, 1975:4, 2072:5, 2140:22 Pull [2] - 1928:1, 2106:21 pulled [2] - 2075:25, 2111:13 pulse [1] - 2110:23 pulses [2] - 2111:1, 2111:5 pump [1] - 2023:8 pumpage [1] - 2137:7 pumping [20] - 1986:25, 1987:4,	quantity [3] - 2065:8, 2119:6, 2132:3 quarter [1] - 2139:3 questioned [1] - 2054:2 questions [16] - 1943:18, 1955:6, 1959:7, 2015:8, 2027:12, 2042:19, 2060:22, 2063:23, 2066:18, 2107:22, 2112:3, 2115:2, 2125:18, 2129:19, 2145:12, 2145:17 quick [1] - 2080:12 quite [8] - 2011:3, 2053:1, 2062:9, 2064:23, 2068:25, 2077:13, 2090:13,
predict [1] - 1961:21 predicted [9] - 1934:5.	2007:17, 2007:18, 2007:20, 2007:23	1940:25, 1942:5, 1960:23	1987:16, 1987:18, 2002:9, 2003:8.	2130:23
1934:12, 1934:19,	2007:25, 2008:21,	Projected [1] -	2022:19, 2023:5,	R
1961:12, 1961:16, 1961:18, 1962:6, 1966:10, 1966:18, 1967:13, 1969:6 predicting [3] - 1952:11, 1953:17 prediction [1] - 2094:18 predictive [1] - 1951:21 predicts [3] - 1941:5, 1954:4, 1954:16 prefatory [1] - 2076:3 prefer [1] - 1975:12 prefiled [10] - 2060:16, 2072:4, 2074:4, 2099:25, 2100:14, 2100:18, 2100:25, 2101:5, 2107:7, 2114:20 prepare [1] - 2074:9 prepared [7] - 1947:25, 2003:11, 2004:2, 2041:24, 2100:3, 2115:19.	2009:12, 2009:9, 2009:14, 2015:24, 2016:1, 2066:17, 2068:13, 2069:12, 2069:13, 2069:16, 2070:7, 2070:8, 2070:18, 2071:13, 2075:3, 2076:4, 2076:5, 2076:7 problem [1] - 1977:3 procedure [2] - 2071:16, 2076:9 proceed [4] - 1986:4, 2013:21, 2045:20, 2092:6 proceeding [1] - 2046:1 Proceeding [1] - 2148:23 PROCEEDINGS [2] - 1925:9, 1927:1 Proceedings [1] - 2149:6	2115:15 projecting [1] - 1937:25 projections [1] - 1937:5 projects [4] - 1939:16, 1946:24, 2139:8, 2140:1 pronged [1] - 2132:19 proper [2] - 2033:6, 2085:5 property [2] - 2130:11, 2143:17 proposed [3] - 1967:14, 2097:9, 2098:1 proposes [2] - 1967:5, 2098:25 protection [4] - 2086:4, 2109:8, 2131:6, 2144:6 protective [1] - 2081:4 provide [7] - 1946:1, 2007:12, 2038:7	2022:17, 2028:21, 2028:25, 2029:18, 2030:2, 2030:10, 2031:16, 2035:24, 2053:22, 2055:9, 2121:18, 2137:25 purpose [6] - 1943:22, 2012:15, 2066:15, 2066:16, 2133:12, 2136:11 purposes [4] - 1946:23, 1959:12, 2090:19, 2118:15 pursue [1] - 2130:20 put [12] - 1939:11, 1951:11, 1970:24, 1991:7, 2004:2, 2050:16, 2055:15, 2060:17, 2072:7, 2074:6, 2081:15, 2083:25 putting [2] - 2059:12, 2112:2	racheting [1] - 2132:13 rain [10] - 2020:19, 2063:1, 2063:2, 2063:3, 2063:7, 2063:16, 2101:19 rainfall [33] - 1996:5, 2006:10, 2006:13, 2006:17, 2007:2, 2020:15, 2041:10, 2046:9, 2049:4, 2049:9, 2050:1, 2058:12, 2059:24, 2060:7, 2061:22, 2062:21, 2063:20, 2064:6, 2064:12, 2065:14, 2065:16, 2066:19, 2078:13, 2078:19, 2078:21, 2082:1, 2082:2 raining [1] - 2063:12
2147:24	2058:25, 2070:23,	2038:14, 2096:8,	Q	raise [2] - 1927:18, 2106:13
present [3] - 1928:7, 2000:5, 2048:16 Present [1] - 1925:23 presented [3] - 1963:25, 1999:19, 2091:19 preserve [1] - 2132:10 preserving [1] - 2145:1 press [1] - 2127:23 pretrial [1] - 2095:19 pretty [7] - 1930:14, 1945:9, 1992:19,	2132:1, 2138:15, 2144:8 processes [1] - 2105:6 produce [7] - 1933:23, 1934:20, 1935:2, 1938:12, 1975:19, 2048:3, 2094:21 produced [12] - 1933:9, 1934:10, 1936:4, 1938:13, 1938:15, 1965:20, 2000:21, 2056:6 THH	2120:22, 2140:11 provided [1] - 2060:8 providing [1] - 2083:19 Pruitt [1] - 1929:2 PRUITT [1] - 1925:22 public [3] - 2130:5, 2132:20, 2137:17 Public [2] - 1925:15, 2149:2 publish [1] - 2058:4 published [4] - E REPORTING GI	qualify [1] - 1978:11 qualitatively [1] - 2089:16 quality [1] - 2079:11 quantify [5] - 1989:6, 2006:4, 2118:25, 2119:10, 2120:19 quantifying [1] - 2014:1 quantifying [1] - 2028:20 ROUP ties [1] - 2119:4	RALPH [1] - 1925:11 ran [7] - 1942:14, 1942:16, 1976:13, 2024:3, 2024:6, 2033:16, 2034:11 range [4] - 2000:6, 2086:5, 2099:2, 2111:5 ranges [1] - 2030:18 ranging [1] - 2111:6 ratchet [1] - 2134:10 rates [1] - 2028:25

rather [1] - 1945:10	reassuring [1] -	2050:19, 2051:1,	references [1] -	2062:25
rating [1] - 2047:22	2075:1	2053:10, 2057:5,	2033:14	relatively [3] -
Ray [2] - 2071:2,	recalibrate [1] -	2062:5, 2062:6,	referred [11] -	2020:25, 2021:6,
2071:10	2076:5	2063:7, 2088:21,	1977:22, 2003:16,	2137:10
reach [12] - 1961:19,	recalibrated [3] -	2101:25, 2135:4	2018:1, 2059:16,	relax [1] - 2148:17
1962:7, 1989:17,	2007:16, 2008:4,	recross [1] - 2096:24	2063:23, 2076:6,	release [6] - 1964:19,
1989:18, 1989:20,	2008:12	Recross [1] - 1926:2	2082:17, 2082:24,	1964:23, 2039:3,
1990:1, 1990:9,	recalibration [2] -	RECROSS [1] -	2092:11, 2092:20,	2039:14, 2094:11,
1992:13, 1992:19,	2008:20, 2009:5	2097:1	2103:2	2094:12
1992:21, 2005:8,	receive [1] - 2088:3	red [7] - 2003:4,	referring [10] - 1939:9,	released [3] - 1966:20,
2127:22	received [1] - 2055:13	2009:13, 2077:8,	1945:19, 1955:24,	2035:5, 2094:23
reached [2] - 2014:9,	receiving [1] -	2087:5, 2136:9,	2017:22, 2018:1,	releases [15] - 1934:2,
2142:23	1983:11	2141:23, 2141:24	2018:16, 2082:5,	1948:20, 1948:21,
reaches [8] - 1993:1.	recent 191 - 1971 7	redid [1] - 2007:14	2084:17, 2135:6,	1953:17. 1964:4.
2002:25, 2003:5,	1971.9 1993.15	REDIRECT [2] -	2136:1	1965:1. 1965:6.
2004:20, 2004:23.	1993:20, 1994:1	2041:4. 2129:20	refers [5] - 1989:20,	1965:9, 1965:13,
2005:22, 2041:18	1997.21 1998.4	redirect [1] - 2097:3	1990:1. 2036:23.	1966:12, 1967:17,
read (5) - 1931.20	2057:23, 2075:18	Redirect [1] - 1926:2	2079:13. 2099:17	1988:20, 1988:23,
2028.18 2036.5	recess [1] - 2148.2	redone [1] - 2008-17	reflect [3] - 1998:4	2038:21, 2039:9
2025:10, 2000.0,	Becass [1] - 2140.2		2010:15 2075:19	releasing 131 -
roading 101 2110:16	2042-9 210E-22	reduce [1] - 2136.1	reflected (6) -	1949:15 1962:17
2122.12	2042.8, 2105.23	1072:11 2016:22		1963:4
2122.10	recognize [5] -	1972.11, 2016.22,	2005:10, 2005:25	
reads [1] - 2120.22	1946:5, 1975:6,	2037:14, 2054:23	2003.10, 2003.23,	
ready [3] - 2126.1,	1977:10, 1979:20,	reduces [1] - 2030:11	2004.10, 2004.10	2030.21, 2000.4,
2147:20, 2148:17	2079:25	reducing [2] -	1050:15	2070.7, 2004.7,
real [3] - 1963:1,	recognized [2] -	2037:10, 2038:16	1950.15	2080:9, 2093:1
1963:3, 2144:6	2051:17, 2059:22	reduction [13] -	reflection [1] - 2095.8	relevant [1] - 1959:15
realistic [1] - 2030:19	recollection [2] -	1933:22, 1936:9,		reliability [1] - 2058:1
reality [2] - 1954:11,	1942:21, 1959:1	1939:24, 1942:4,	1954:11	reliable [3] - 2007:12,
2114:3	record [26] - 1947:7,	1942:10, 1968:15,	reflects [1] - 2011:9	2058:4, 2058:5
realized [1] - 1956:8	1958:7, 1958:12,	1968:19, 1969:10,	refresh [1] - 1958:25	reliance [1] - 2034:21
really [24] - 1992:16,	1958:17, 1959:12,	1969:12, 1969:15,	regard [6] - 2048:5,	relied [9] - 1951:6,
1998:25, 1999:7,	1959:15, 1973:4,	1969:22, 1969:24,	2050:7, 2069:12,	1998:18, 2026:13,
2041:16, 2050:6,	1985:6, 1999:5,	2023:9	2069:16, 2081:10,	2030:5, 2030:9,
2051:8, 2053:2,	2047:11, 2047:23,	Reduction [3] -	2093:2	2044:15, 2044:21,
2053:23, 2054:22,	2049:4, 2050:8,	1939:19, 1940:17	regime [4] - 2084:7,	2090:2, 2093:23
2058:19, 2065:7,	2069:19, 2087:3,	reductions [2] -	2084:10, 2086:25,	relief [1] - 2143:3
2066:2, 2068:12,	2089:12, 2103:5,	1935:21, 2123:11	2092:15	rely [10] - 2024:15,
2071:18, 2076:7,	2106:3, 2106:8,	refamiliarize [1] -	region [1] - 2125:2	2027:4, 2027:19,
2076:13, 2076:15,	2108:13, 2115:9,	2080:12	regression [1] -	2027:24, 2028:1,
2077:25, 2078:10,	2120:6, 2125:19,	refer [17] - 1991:20,	2020:3	2033:9, 2043:2,
2084:10, 2094:21,	2126:6, 2127:3,	2007:16, 2023:20,	regulation [2] -	2058:7, 2059:15,
2095:8, 2103:4,	2127:4	2028:8, 2043:6,	2079:5, 2087:16	2078:13
2138:4	recorded [8] - 1947:7,	2049:17, 2049:18,	regulations [4] -	relying [2] - 2014:4,
reason [9] - 1954:19,	2041:15, 2044:12,	2058:16, 2070:5,	2077:2, 2079:9,	2014:5
2026:17, 2026:22,	2049:4, 2054:10,	2075:4, 2076:24,	2079:11	remaining [1] -
2039:13, 2064:21,	2055:3, 2077:23,	2084:6. 2084:12.	regulatory [6] -	1994:25
2073:5, 2092:11,	2088:22	2093:19. 2094:17.	2078:14. 2118:13.	remedy [3] - 2073:16,
2095:7, 2098:5	recorder [1] - 2044:9	2132:18, 2140:20	2138:6. 2144:14.	2097:5. 2099:1
reasonable [10] -	recording [1] -	reference [11] -	2144:21 2144:22	remember [4] -
1981:6. 1981:18.	2050:22	2072:15, 2073:9	reiterate [1] - 2134:22	2053:12, 2072:9.
2062:10. 2074:1.	recordings [1] -	2080:16 2081:12	relate (2) - 2013-11	2100:5, 2134:19
2074:3. 2083:12.	2055:1	2083.16, 2084.19	2073·20	remind [1] - 2148.7
2114:1, 2132:3	records [24] -	2092:3 2093:1	related (6) - 2002.20	remiss [1] - 2052.22
2132:20, 2132.24	1955.19 2041.16	2106:4 2133:3	2020.17 2011.12	remove 111 - 2130-11
reasonably 111 -	2041.21 2041.25	2135.20	2023.17, 2041.12, 2042.21 2047.21	ronoat [1] - 1030.0
1946.9	2041.21, 2041.20, 2045:11 2047:7	Referenced MI -	2072.21, 2047.21, 2072.13	1068.2 2011.0
reasons 151 - 105/1·1	2047.1, 2047.1, 2047.19	1926·8	2014.10 relates (4) 2070-12	1900.2, 2014.0, 2014.16 2026.20
1054.12 1054.1,	2071.0, 2071.12, 2017.23 201/2.12	referenced 141	relationship in:	2014.10, 2020.20, 2007:20, 2124:12
2051.13, 1334.23, 2051.17 2102.2	2077.20, 2090.12, 2040.5 2050.0 TTT			2097.20, 2104.10
2001.17,2100.0		, VREAVITING GI		repeating [1] -
	ъл			1

2019:13	reproduces [1] -	2094:10	1934:11, 1935:6,	2044:11, 2046:6,
report [56] - 1935:25,	1964:4	resource [4] -	1935:21, 1941:22,	2046:8, 2047:16,
1936:3, 1936:4,	request [3] - 2073:19,	1946:24, 2132:11,	1942:4, 1981:16,	2047:21, 2052:1,
1936:5, 1936:17,	2074:1. 2074:3	2132:13, 2144:7	1989:11, 2009:4,	2058:13, 2060:2,
1937:10, 1938:7,	require [1] - 2114:10	resources [1] -	2011:20, 2069:5,	2060:14, 2102:15,
1938:8, 1938:16,	required [3] - 2129:5.	2124:13	2074:20, 2102:9	2103:10, 2104:7,
1939:20, 1941:12,	2130:23, 2137:4	Resources [1] -	results [35] - 1935:16,	2104:15, 2104:17,
1947:24, 1952:20,	requirement [2] -	2083:6	1935:23, 1936:2,	2119:1, 2119:7,
1952:22, 1953:20,	2131:20, 2139:6	respect [8] - 1944:1.	1936:6, 1936:8,	2119:11, 2119:19,
1955:9, 1955:12,	requirements [5] -	1957:6. 1974:20.	1936:16, 1937:8,	2119:22, 2135:5,
1956:7, 1959:10,	2114:2. 2114:5.	1986:24, 1992:5,	1937:14, 1953:15,	2144:24, 2145:9
1961:2, 1961:22,	2121:2, 2121:5	1993:2. 1993:4.	1955:11, 1955:15,	River [61] - 1932:6,
1972:15, 1978:9,	2131:24	2017:24	1961:2, 1962:3,	1932:12, 1935:11,
1997:1, 1997:5,	requires [4] - 2093-24	respects [1] - 2057:16	1963:11, 1979:20,	1969:11, 1969:23,
1998:3, 1998:15,	2124.16 2124.21	respond [1] - 1949:14	2008:21, 2009:1,	1970:15, 1970:21,
1999:12, 2009:7,	2130.21	response [5] -	2009:8, 2010:17,	1980:10, 1981:3,
2028:1, 2028:5,	requiring [1] - 2125.8	2063.22 2065.9	2010:23, 2012:3,	1981:5, 1981:6,
2028:8, 2028:10,	reread [1] - 2032:3	2065:15, 2096:17	2012:6, 2012:18,	1981:11, 1981:16,
2028:19, 2030:25,	reservation rol -	2129:4	2012:19, 2016:12,	1981:20, 1981:21,
2031:3, 2031:7,	2125.14 2125.10	ResSim 1601 -	2019:1, 2024:15,	1986:21, 1988:7,
2033:6, 2033:20,	2125:21 2126:3	1929:23, 1930:2	2026:7, 2027:16,	1988:10, 1988:15,
2035:19, 2036:3,	2126.8 2126.14	1930:3 1930.14	2033:11, 2033:17,	1989:3, 2002:10,
2036:23, 2037:18,	2126:20 2144.1	1930:15. 1930:18	2074:12, 2075:3,	2003:1, 2004:17,
2051:20, 2068:23,	2120.20, 2144.1, 2144.5	1930.22 1931.17	2078:24, 2103:23	2004:24, 2005:2,
2075:25, 2078:18,	reservations 151 -	1934:1, 1934:3	retrofit [1] - 2139:10	2005:3, 2005:6,
2091:17, 2091:23,	2121.11 2121.23	1934.10 1934.12	return [2] - 2049:19,	2005:12, 2005:20,
2100:15, 2100:17,	2121.11, 2121.20,	1934:25, 1935:9	2059:2	2005:22, 2038:12,
2101:6, 2101:7,	2140.23, 2144.4, 2144.23	1935:16, 1936:8	review [2] - 2029:20,	2038:15, 2044:1,
2111:21, 2115:18,	reserved [1] - 2013-16	1936:13, 1936:24	2109:21	2046:13, 2046:15,
2140:11	reservoir [26] -	1937:14, 1937:23,	reviewed [8] -	2046:17, 2046:18,
reported [14] -		1941:11, 1941:17,	2014:12, 2014:14,	2046:25, 2047:2,
1955:12, 1977:11,	1920.19, 1936.25	1942:14, 1942:17,	2019:16, 2027:2,	2047:9, 2049:12,
1979:8, 1979:13,	1940.19, 1941.7	1942:20, 1944:18,	2027:3, 2029:12,	2050:21, 2057:3,
1992:10, 1997:12,	1941.13 1941.22	1944:21, 1947:24,	2034:17, 2036:6	2078:17, 2079:15,
1998:7, 2001:6,	1945:3 1946:24	1949:20, 1950:10,	revised [4] - 1957:8,	2080:1, 2080:7,
2001:22, 2024:15,	1947:4 1948:12	1950:11, 1950:14,	1957:13, 1964:16,	2081:12, 2082:25,
2043:4, 2047:25,	1961.7 1962.15	1951:4, 1951:8,	1997:10	2086:10, 2087:1,
2087:19, 2117:8	1962.20 1963.12	1953:11, 1953:18,	revision [1] - 1946:12	2109:8, 2109:25,
Reporter [1] - 2149:16	1964.10 1988.17	1954:2, 1954:9,	revisiting [1] -	2118:5, 2121:13,
reporter [1] - 1943:7	1988:19, 1992:24	1954:14, 1954:17,	2083:24	2134:18, 2144:13,
reports [12] - 1961:3,	1993:5, 1993:11	1956:2, 1956:20,	Reynoldsville [9] -	2144:17
1983:16, 1990:11,	2094:8, 2095:2	1956:24, 1957:2,	1991:13, 1991:17,	riverine [10] - 2084:13,
2016:17, 2033:11,	2095:4, 2114:11	1958:19, 1959:16,	1991:19, 1991:24,	2084:20, 2084:25,
2111:21, 2111:24,	reservoirs [33] -	1959:20, 1959:23,	1992:1, 1992:9,	2085:4, 2085:6,
2113:12, 2116:2,	1939:1. 1939:4	1960:3, 1960:6,	1992:14, 1993:6,	2086:9, 2099:14,
2116:6, 2137:7,	1939:24. 1941:1.	1960:8, 1960:12,	1993:9	2099:16, 2105:17
2137:12	1944:15, 1944:19,	1960:21, 2093:17,	right-hand [3] -	Rivers [4] - 2125:15,
represent [2] -	1944:22, 1944:25,	2093:23, 2095:1,	1977:1, 2004:6,	2126:9, 2126:22,
2061:11, 2141:25	1945:5, 1945:13,	2095:2, 2095:5	2092:15	2141:21
representative [3] -	1946:21, 1947:20,	restaurants [1] -	RIOP [8] - 1934:2,	rivers [11] - 1996:20,
1999:3, 1999:9,	1948:10, 1948:23,	2148:14	1964:14, 1964:19,	2041:19, 2046:7,
2076:14	1949:6, 1949:11,	restricted [1] -	1965:3, 1965:9,	2049:11, 2071:14,
represented [2] -	1949:15, 1949:21,	2039:19	2094:10, 2094:19,	2085:11, 2085:12,
2086:12, 2098:13	1949:25, 1950:5,	restrictions [9] -	2094:24	2099:18, 2104:7,
represents [1] -	1950:7, 1995:5,	2096:9, 2122:9,	risk [1] - 2078:23	2120:16, 2126:12
2060:25	1995:7, 1995:9,	2122:16, 2122:25,	river [31] - 1945:6,	RMR [2] - 1925:14,
reproduced [6] -	1995:19, 1995:20,	2123:3, 2123:7,	1992:22, 2004:16,	2149:15
1939:19, 1940:5,	1995:22, 2038:22,	2123:17, 2123:21,	2005:2, 2041:10,	role [2] - 1946:25,
1997:22, 2000:18,	2039:1, 2039:14,	2123:25	2043:7, 2043:12,	1948:12
2000:20, 2147:3	2071:23, 2094:9 TH	E reporting Gi	ROUP :13, 2044:3,	roll [1] - 2148:17
		01(111(0 0)	··· • • - I	
1	M	lason & Lockha	rt	

	ant	0 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	1001.10 1000.10	0050.0
root [1] - 2044:8	sat [1] - 1943:5	SCOTT [1] - 2128:23	1991:13, 1998:13,	seem [3] - 2056:2,
roots [1] - 2049:15	satellite [1] - 2141:10	screen [10] - 1931:15,	2001.7, 2002.10,	2070.10, 2078.6
rose [1] - 1937:24	satisfaction [1] -	1939:11, 1965:19,	2003:15, 2004:15,	Sees [1] - 2056:22
rotation [1] - 2139:18	2076:17	1982.21, 1991.8,	2005.5, 2005.15,	segment [1] - 2055:11
rough [1] - 2130:14	satisfied [2] - 2008:3,	2055:15, 2060:17,	2006.22, 2010.10,	selected [2] - 2029:22,
roughly [8] - 2048:15,	2008:11	2072:5, 2084:5,	2011.0, 2011.13,	2128:24
2050:24, 2069:11,	Save [3] - 2066:13,	2140.23	2014.10, 2014.10,	selection [1] - 2000:2
2073:6, 2073:23,	2139:2, 2139:23	screened [4] - 2036:8,	2022.1, 2022.2,	Seminole [83] -
2075:15, 2075:22,	saves [1] - 1975:19	2030:11, 2030:17,	2022.1, 2023.9,	1929:24, 1942:19,
2113:14	saw [1] - 2145:4	2037.5	2023.19, 2020.9, 2028.10	1943:21, 1943:25,
round [2] - 2032:6,	scale [5] - 2010:9,	SCIOII [1] - 2140.24	2020.10, 2020.13,	1944:4, 1944:12,
2103:17	2010:12, 2016:12,	search [3] - 1970:13,	2030.21, 2040.24, 2044.7, 2045.1	1944:24, 1945:2,
routes [1] - 2059:8	2060:1, 2131:19	1979:16, 1979:20	2044.7, 2043.1,	1945:3, 1945:6,
row [2] - 1956:8,	scaling [1] - 2062:20	Season [4] - 2001.13,	2048.16 2048.21	1947:3, 1947:5,
2061:1	scenario [49] - 1932:3,	2110:1, 2110:24,	2040:10, 2040:21,	1947.8, 1947.18,
rows [2] - 1957:7,	1932:14, 1933:21,		2050:10, 2001:2,	1949:10, 1949:13,
1957:10	1933:23, 1934:4,	Seasonality [3] -	2053:24 2056:14	1950.2, 1950.9,
Rule [3] - 2122:5,	1934:13, 1934:20,	2101:22, 2104:4,	2057:22 2061:5	1950.15, 1951.1,
2122:7, 2122:15	1937:4, 1937:18,	2104:12 2009-00-0121-5	2061.7 2061.8	1951.7, 1953.0,
rule [1] - 1994:23	1938:19, 1939:14,	seasons [2] - 2131.5,	2061.9 2061.17	1953.9, 1953.10,
rules [6] - 1930:19,	1939:18, 1940:11,	2109.19	2064:10. 2065:17	1953.21, 1954.1,
1964:10, 1964:13,	1940:19, 1940:24,	Seated [2] - 1927.25,	2066.1 2069.9	1954.4, 1954.10,
2094:5, 2094:19,	1941:6, 1942:6,	2100:20	2070:4, 2072:14	1954.14, 1954.10,
2122:22	1961:5, 1962:5,	second [19] - 1942:15,	2072:19.2072:20	1954.19, 1954.24, 1056:1, 1056:22
ruling [2] - 1995:22,	1966:5, 1966:19,	1957:15, 1980:7,	2074.14, 2076.20	1950.1, 1950.22,
2013:22	1966:23, 1966:25,	1993:13, 2032:17,	2077:11, 2079:22	1956.21, 1959.10,
run [27] - 1931:16,	1967:2, 1967:5,	2033:9, 2036:7,	2081:19, 2083:4.	1900.4, 1900.13, 1960:15, 1960:22
1931:20, 1932:4,	1967:9, 1968:18,	2043:15, 2043:16,	2083:16, 2084:6	1900.13, 1900.22,
1934:4, 1945:6,	1908.24, 1909.4,	2047.24, 2054.12,	2084:21, 2092:18,	1901.0, 1901.7, 1961.8, 1961.12
1960:15, 1960:19,	1909:9, 1909:17,	2080:15, 2084:5,	2093:7. 2093:8.	1061:18 1061:10
1961:5, 1961:22,	1970.2, 2090.17, 2000:6, 2110:4	2095.22, 2112.0,	2094:19, 2095:22,	1962.2 1962.6
1962:3, 1987:3,	2099.0, 2110.4,	2119.10, 2121.24,	2098:3. 2098:16.	1962:2, 1962:12
2024:17, 2024:21,	2110.0, 2110.7,	2120.19, 2120.21 Secretary (9)	2101:24, 2103:11,	1962:19 1962:22
2024:24, 2025:4,	2110.9, 2110.19,	2120-24 2141-6	2108:16, 2108:19,	1963:3 1963:7
2025:5, 2025:8,	2110.20, 2110.22, 2111.5	2120.24, 2141.0	2109:1, 2109:9,	1963.11 1963.18
2025:14, 2025:22,	2111.1, 2111.3,	1049:0 1095:12	2109:12, 2110:6,	1964:3 1964:8
2025:25, 2026:3,	2113.10, 2113.14,	1940.9, 1905.12,	2110:20, 2110:22,	1965:17, 1965:22
2034:2, 2034:5,	scenarios 1201 -	2005-6 2036-7	2111:8, 2111:9,	1966:5 1966:9
2034.0, 2034.13,	1031.0 1035.17	2003.0, 2030.7, 211/.1	2112:6, 2112:10,	1966:15, 1966:18,
2039.17, 2070.14	1931.9, 1930.17,	sections (4) - 2013:11	2112:13, 2112:17,	1967:9, 1967:13.
run-or-river [1] -	1965.17 1966.1	Sections [1] - 2013.11	2113:11, 2113:15,	1968:23, 1969:2.
1945.0	2016:12 2097:10	1031.25 10/0.8	2113:16, 2113:18,	1969:17, 1970:2.
run-on [1] - 2070.14	2097:25 2098:6	1931.23, 1940.0,	2113:19, 2113:24,	1988:16, 1988:21,
1062:2 2025:19	2098:14, 2098:21	1940.9, 1940.12,	2114:6, 2115:16,	1991:21, 1992:15,
1903.3, 2025.10,	2098:24, 2098:25	1946:16 1946:18	2115:22, 2116:1,	2044:18, 2052:8,
2020.5	2099:2. 2109:21	1948:6 1948:12	2116:3, 2116:5,	2052:9, 2093:17,
2006-8 2006-13	2109:24, 2110:16,	1948.17 1948.24	2116:6, 2116:20,	2093:23, 2094:13,
2000.8, 2000.13,	2112:20, 2114:4	1953:3 1953:13	2116:22, 2116:23,	2095:7
2000.17, 2007.2,	schedules [1] -	1955:13, 1957:17	2117:1, 2122:11,	Senate [1] - 2141:8
2041.10, 2000.19, 2078:10, 2078:21	2124:22	1966:25, 1976:15	2128:13, 2128:17,	send [1] - 2138:6
2070.19, 2070.21	science [2] - 2041:8.	1976:17, 1976:19	2128:20, 2129:7,	sending [1] - 2146:7
rural 131 - 21/2.7	2074:11	1976:23. 1978:1.	2129:13, 2129:14,	sense [9] - 1949:22,
2142.1, 2142.1 , 2142.1	Science [1] - 2068:24	1978:3. 1979:16.	2139:14, 2141:20,	1949:23, 1988:4,
2142.13, 2142.13	scientific [2] - 2041:7	1979:17, 1979:19.	2141:23, 2142:8,	1993:17, 2008:18,
6	2068:24	1980:1, 1983:6.	2142:10, 2143:10	2018:11, 2037:17,
<u> </u>	scientists [2] -	1983:21, 1984:3,	seeding [1] - 2038:18	2065:18, 2089:5
salinities [1] - 2110:4	2135:2. 2140:10	1984:10, 1984:11,	seeing [4] - 1975:25,	sensitive [2] -
salinity [1] - 2110:9	score [1] - 1952:3	1985:4, 1986:18,	2077:5, 2089:17,	2104:16, 2104:17
sample [1] - 2072:18	scores [1] - 1957:2 파비	E REPORTING CI	ROUP 9	sent [2] - 2013:15,
			ig [1] - 2130:8	
	N	lason & Lockha	rt	1

2129:2	2011:13	2009:8, 2009:13,	2045:20, 2045:23,	smaller [1] - 2075:17
sentence [11] -	sheet [2] - 1968:8,	2009:16, 2009:19,	2046:2, 2052:12,	smart [1] - 2131:12
2080:15, 2081:19,	2000:21	2011:16, 2056:16,	2052:19, 2053:1,	Smith [7] - 1943:15,
2083:15, 2083:18,	shift [6] - 1980:24,	2089:6, 2091:13,	2053:5, 2055:16,	1947:12, 1955:2,
2083:21, 2084:4,	1986:8, 1993:18,	2092:22, 2100:4	2055:20, 2055:23,	1959:3, 2013:4,
2084:18, 2085:15,	1996:2, 2002:6,	side [6] - 2004:3,	2056:2, 2056:5,	2027:8, 2039:25
2095:25, 2129:1,	2114:19	2088:14, 2088:15,	2079:18, 2079:24,	sod [1] - 2139:18
2129:9	shifting [1] - 2120:24	2088:24, 2092:15	2082:18, 2082:20,	sod-based [1] -
sentences [1] -	shifts [2] - 1981:3.	signals [1] - 2053:24	2086:18, 2086:19,	2139:18
2097:23	1993:14	significance [2] -	2088:12, 2090:5,	soil [4] - 2049:15
separate [1] - 2121:22	short [3] - 2027:15.	2018:5, 2083:9	2090:7, 2091:2,	2131:4. 2132:7.
September [26] -	2027:20. 2030:17	significant [6] -	2091:5, 2091:9,	2133:17
1940:1. 1941:2.	short-term [3] -	2018:7. 2038:8.	2091:11, 2091:21,	solely [1] - 2102.7
1941:8, 1942:6,	2027:15 2027:20	2070:4. 2085:24.	2092:7, 2092:8,	solemniv (2) -
1957:22, 1958:3,	2030:17	2103:4, 2144:16	2095:12, 2095:14,	1927 20 2106 15
1960:1. 1977:23.	shortage [4] - 2122:5	significantly [2] -	2096:23, 2099:9,	someone [1] - 2018:8
1978:8, 1979:1,	2122.7. 2122.15	1972:7. 2124:12	2105:12	somenlace [1] -
1979:2. 2010:2.	2122.7, 2122.10,	similar [16] - 1930:15.	single [7] - 1935:7,	2130·15
2061:6. 2061:7.	shortfall [2] - 2092-12	1933:10, 1934:8	1945:2, 1990:19,	sometimes 101 -
2061:17. 2064:19.	2092.17	1934:17, 1934:22	1996:14, 2057:6,	2023·20 2130·10
2072:19. 2073:14.	shortfalls [1] -	1935:4. 1938:2.	2088:23, 2141:11	2020.20, 2130.19,
2090:13, 2100:23,	2000.17	1941:14 1941:20	single-day [1] -	2130.21, 2130.23,
2100:24, 2102:13,	shots [1] - 1965:19	2057:13 2057:15	2088:23	2130.3, 2130.3,
2103:14, 2103:25,	show [22] - 1935.14	2061.14 2068.19	sit 151 - 2025:16.	2130.7, 2139.24
2107:25, 2109:11	1030·2 1075·1	2069:2. 2073:13	2045:4. 2052:17.	2061.8 2061.10
series [3] - 2060:12.	1081.3 1081.15	similarity [1] - 2075:1	2120:25, 2121:7	2001.0, 2001.10
2063:16, 2069:4	1001.1 1007.23	similarly [2] - 1953:8	sitting [2] - 2053:3.	2021-2 2045-4
seriously [2] - 2055:9.	1008.8 1000.12	2011·24	2148:10	2031.3, 2045.4,
2055:10	2003.4 2041.24	simple [1] - 1992-19	six [1] - 1980:15	2097.11, 2090.2,
serves [1] - 2071:4	2053.10 2072.9	simply [3] - 2025:3	size [1] - 2114:11	2100.3, 2114.13,
Service (5) - 2080:18.	2033.10, 2072.3,	2095·2 2102·11	slide [25] - 1976:13.	2142.21
2080.24 2081.2	2100.21 2101.13	simulato M - 1931.3	1976:20 1978:12	Sorab [1] - 2020.2
2081:14, 2083:5	2108:6 2111:10	1036·24 1044·24	1979:19, 1979:20.	SOILY [20] - 1900.1,
services (3) - 2081-4	2115:1 2110:6	1040.10	1982:21, 1991:7.	1972.10, 1977.2,
2081.5 2138.20	2130.17 2135.4	simulated MI -	1991:8. 1991:11.	1965.2, 1999.22, 2004:4, 2041:2
set 181 - 1931-11	showed [16] -	1032.24 1067.10	1997:23, 2004:1.	2004.4, 2041.3,
1959.10 1980.7	1034·25 1035·0	1969.18 1970.3	2004:4. 2005:18.	2033.24, 2002.10,
1986.11 1997.21	1935.18 1958.20	simulates 131 -	2017:5. 2017:6.	2071.7, 2073.12,
1999:3 1999:9	1959.17 1960.3	1044.18 1044.21	2052:10. 2086:16.	2004.1, 2091.2, 2001·1/ 2007·20
2042:1	1960.12 1962.11	1945.2	2086:21, 2087:1,	2091.14, 2091.20, 2100.2, 2100.14
sets [7] - 1964:19	1962.19 1968.23	simulation 131 -	2088:10, 2088:18,	2100.2, 2100.14,
1986:10, 1994:6	1976.12 1998.14	2029.5 2030.1	2098:12, 2098:13,	2121.20, 2123.23, 2131.16
1995:1, 1998:3	1998.19 1998.21	2131.20	2098:16	sort rei - 1982·1
1999:11. 2008:23	1998:22, 1998:23	simulations III -	slides [1] - 1982:23	2057·17 2089·2
seven [1] - 2051:3	showing [4] -	2025.25	slightly [1] - 2064:11	2007:17, 2000:2, 2137:10, 2144:21
several [5] - 1935:19.	2052:11, 2053:12	Singarella 121 -	small [29] - 1932:11,	2107:10, 2144.21, 2146:18
2010:24, 2013:15	2057:12, 2093:4	1927·10 2088·14	1969:12, 1969:24,	sorts (1) - 2139.12
2089:23	shown [5] - 1953:3.	SINGARELLA (57) -	1984:12, 1995:20,	sound [1] - 2017:19
severe [4] - 1973:21.	1953:5, 1983:4	1925.18 1927.5	2018:20, 2018:21,	sound [1] = 2017.10
1973:25, 1974:2.	2047:12, 2053:6	1927.9 1927.17	2019:1, 2019:11,	2017·20
2093:6	shows [29] - 1937:13	1928.6 1928.10	2019:21, 2019:22,	Source 121 - 2015:8
shading [1] - 2089:6	1937:23, 1939:13	1928.12 1967.24	2020:8, 2020:11,	2000.1 2001.20
shall [4] - 1927:21	1941:12, 1941:19	1975:24, 1976:3	2020:14, 2020:17,	southern 121 -
1927:22. 2106:16	1942:10, 1955:15	2025:2, 2040.9	2020:22, 2021:4,	2136·15 2126·16
2106:17	1956:5, 1956:20.	2040:12, 2040:19	2050:18, 2050:19,	sneaking 101 - 2122.4
Shanahan 🖽 -	1961:14, 1961:24.	2040:23, 2041:1	2051:11, 2053:19,	2135.1 2136.10
2094:25	1962:18, 1970:14.	2041:5. 2041:22	2077:13, 2092:20,	SPECIAL 1901
share [2] - 2139:8	1970:20, 1972:21.	2042:5, 2042:10.	2092:21, 2119:7,	
2145:7	1977:17, 1986:18.	2042:14, 2042:18	2134:23, 2137:10,	1923.11, 1927.2,
sharp [2] - 2011:7	2002:20, 2005:2 TH	REPORTING CI	ROUP :7, 2142:13	1927.0, 1927.10, 1928.9 1928.10
	, III			1320.3, 1320.13,
	M	lagon (Togkha	r t	

1929:5, 1929:9,	spelled [1] - 2106:25	started [6] - 2043:3,	statistic [4] - 1953:8,	2089:23, 2096:10,
1968:1, 1975:13,	spike [8] - 1984:3,	2093:13, 2108:3,	2057:19, 2076:20,	2118:4
1975:18, 1976:2,	1984:11, 1984:12,	2108:5, 2135:8,	2076:25	streamflows [3] -
1976:5, 1976:21,	1984:20, 1985:1,	2135:15	statistically [1] -	1993:25, 2006:14,
1977:2, 1977:6,	1985:7, 2011:7,	starting [3] - 1971:21,	2070:4	2118:11
1985:16, 1985:22,	2011:14	2048:15, 2050:11	statute [1] - 2124:6	streams [4] - 2002:14,
1986:3, 1999:24,	spindle [1] - 2044:12	starts [3] - 2028:16,	statutes [1] - 2132:18	2002:16, 2002:17,
2013:23, 2040:8,	spoken [1] - 2086:11	2046:10, 2091:6	Stearns [1] - 2145:14	2099:18
2040:11, 2040:17,	spot [1] - 2019:17	state [53] - 1928:2,	STEARNS [1] -	Street [1] - 1925:12
2040:21, 2042:3,	spread [2] - 1968:8,	1929:16, 1930:25,	1925:19	strengths [1] -
2042:12, 2044:22,	2134:23	1932:21, 1933:24,	stenographic [1] -	1950:18
2044:25, 2045:3,	spreadsheet [5] -	1934:7, 1934:16,	2149:5	stretches [2] -
2052:15, 2052:25,	1965:20, 1966:24,	1934:21, 1935:2,	step [3] - 2054:22,	1973:12, 2133:21
2055:18, 2055:21,	2017:7, 2056:10,	1935:9, 1935:20,	2094:18, 2137:23	strong [1] - 2103:9
2056:1, 2090:25,	2056:11	1936:20, 1937:16,	steps [1] - 2062:2	strongly [2] - 2076:13,
2091:8, 2092:5,	Spring [38] - 1967:22,	1937:25, 1938:10,	Steverson [3] -	2096:14
2096:24, 2099:11,	1968:6, 1968:14,	1938:17, 1939:5,	2108:19, 2108:21,	structure [4] -
2099.21, 2100.8,	1968:20, 1986:12,	1940:13, 1941:15,	2141:6	2025:17, 2084:12,
2100.19, 2101.2,	1986:19, 1986:21,	1941:24, 1942:11,	still [8] - 1979:5,	2084:19, 2084:24
2101.11, 2102.3, 2102:6, 2102:16	1986:24, 1987:5,	1949:8, 1960:23,	1992:12, 2030:19,	students [1] - 2008:16
2102.0, 2102.10,	1987:8, 1987:12,	1961:19, 1962:7, 1965:34, 1980:10	2040:12, 2071:24,	studied [2] - 2080:3,
2102.20, 2102.22, 2103.10	1987:16, 1987:17,	1905.24, 1980.10,	2104:7, 2117:14	2092:4
2103.11, 2103.19, 2104·1 2104·19	1987:22, 1988:6,	1901.12, 1902.20,	stopped [2] - 2050:22,	studies [4] - 2060:2,
2104.1, 2104.13,	1988:12, 1989:7,	1903.12, 1903.20, 1084:6, 1084:12	2055:3	2062:22, 2063:17,
2105:14 2105:16	1989:12, 1990:9,	1904.0, 1904.12,	storage [9] - 1945:10,	2145:7
2105:21, 2106:1,	1990.14, 1990.20,	1085.0 1080.1	1945:15, 1950:5,	study [7] - 1987:4,
2107:4, 2107:14	1990.25, 1991.2,	1905.9, 1909.4,	1961:20, 1962:7,	2041:9, 2135:17,
2108:9. 2108:12.	1991.4, 1991.15,	1905.11 1996.17	1962:9, 2020:14,	2135:21, 2135:25,
2111:16. 2115:5.	1991.23, 1992.12, 1003:3-20/4:20	2015:17, 2016:7	2039:1, 2114:5	2136:18, 2139:17
2145:16, 2145:19,	2052.6 2052.7	2029.5 2038.23	store [2] - 2018:22,	SUD [3] - 1967:22,
2146:1, 2146:11,	2052.0, 2052.1,	2039:9, 2044:2.	2039:2	1908:0, 1908:13
2146:14, 2146:21,	2053.18 2053.21	2081:1, 2106:22.	stored [1] - 2060:13	SUD-DASINS [3] -
2146:25, 2147:6,	2054.7 2054.25	2125:2, 2138:23.	story [1] - 2051:7	1907.22, 1908.0,
2147:8, 2147:12,	2055:5	2141:23, 2143:15	straight [1] - 1982:9	1900.13 Subject (4) 2100:6
2147:16, 2148:1,	springs [1] - 2118:11	STATE [2] - 1925:3,	stream [13] - 1989:20,	Subject [1] - 2109.0
2148:5, 2148:20	stack [1] - 2078:20	1925:6	1990:1, 2002:16, 2002:25, 2002:5	2077-21 2091-5
species [5] - 2081:9,	staff [7] - 2119:5	State [17] - 1925:15,	2002.25, 2003.5,	2077.21, 2001.3
2085:2, 2085:3,	2135:1, 2137:12	1925:17, 1925:20,	2043.12, 2043.20,	submittal (4) - 2120:5
2088:5, 2088:8	2137:14, 2140:17.	1927:10, 2073:21,	2054.19, 2055.10,	submitted [1] - 2129.0
specific [11] -	2141:8. 2141:15	2078:13, 2080:6,	2007.4, 2002.11, 2121.17_2134.2	1035-25 1036-3
1932:25, 1957:23,	stage [3] - 2044:9.	2081:23, 2082:13,	streamflow (20) -	1953.23, 1950.3,
1958:3, 1964:22,	2047:16. 2047:22	2090:15, 2093:2,	1071.8 1071.10	1952.22, 1950.7, 1957:7 1997:6
1968:13, 1993:17,	stand [2] - 2052:16.	2095:19, 2096:5,	1971.0, 1971.10, 1987:16 1993:21	1997:16 2016:17
2007:25, 2025:17,	2106:12	2107:20, 2120:14,	1994·20 1995·1	2034.18 2107.8
2060:21, 2124:18,	standard [3] -	2125:7, 2149:3	1995:15 1995:24	subscribe [1] -
2131:3	2132:16, 2132:25,	state-of-the-art [1] -	1996:4, 1996:6	2149.10
specifically [17] -	2133:19	2029:5	2006:4, 2006:9.	subset (3) - 1958-6
1937:12, 1937:18,	standardized [1] -	statement [5] -	2015:17, 2015:21,	1958:10, 1998:7
1943:22, 1948:20,	2065:24	1946:10, 2045:18,	2015:23, 2019:1.	subsets [1] - 1998:14
1968:7, 1969:2,	stands [2] - 1964:16,	2045:25, 2127:16,	2022:22, 2023:1,	substantial [1] -
1971:3, 1974:25,	2131:14	2129:16	2023:6, 2023:17,	2011:2
1981:2, 1986:14,	Stanford [3] - 2071:3,	states [1] - 2136:20	2027:17, 2028:21,	substantially [1] -
1994:5, 2007:20,	2071:9, 2071:11	STATES [1] - 1925:1	2029:2, 2029:17,	2010:21
2031:12, 2032:4,	start [11] - 1930:1,	States [3] - 1930:4,	2030:2, 2030:11,	suddenly [1] -
2035:14, 2037:4,	1946:2, 1985:12,	2043:18, 2043:20	2035:25, 2041:15,	2101:18
2138:22	2013:10, 2028:7,	station [3] - 2043:22,	2041:16, 2041:21,	suggest 151 - 2025:7.
specifiea [1] - 2089:8	2040:15, 2050:23,	2043:23, 2043:24	2041:24, 2053:10,	2050:9, 2139:1.
speii [2] - 1928:2,	2102:1, 2106:4,	stations [4] - 2043:7,	2061:17, 2064:19,	2148:13, 2148:16
2100.22	2138:18, 2143:3 THE	E REPORTING G	ROUP :10, 2072:12,	suggested [3] -

2051:21, 2093:18,	1925:1	1939:18, 1939:20,	2104:5	2097:14, 2097:19,
2096:14	surface [20] - 1987:8,	1953:3, 1953:5,	tender [1] - 2107:11	2097:24, 2098:2,
suggesting [1] -	1987:12, 2019:22,	1955:13, 1955:15,	term [11] - 2023:13,	2098:7, 2100:1,
2148:2	2019:24, 2020:3,	1955:24, 1956:5,	2027:15, 2027:20,	2106:6, 2106:15,
suggestion [1] -	2020:7, 2020:10,	1956:8, 1956:17,	2029:2. 2030:17.	2107:8, 2107:9,
2148.6	2020:18 2020:21	1957:7. 1957:8.	2065:25, 2068:1	2107:23. 2114:20.
suggestions [2] -	2021.5 2022.21	1957.13 1957.19	2075:19 2124:6	2131.15 2136.3
	2022:25 2023:10	1957:21 1958:6	2070.10, 2124.0,	2140.21 2141.8
2140.11, 2140.13	2022.23, 2023.10,	1057.21, 1950.0,	2131.2	2140.21, 2141.0,
Suite [1] - 2043:6	2030:11, 2058:25,	1956.19, 1994.5,	terms [22] - 1931:6,	2141.19, 2143.1,
summarize [1] -	2059:13, 2099:19,	1994:6, 1994:12,	1932:20, 1974:12,	2143:14, 2145:22
2110:15	2099:20, 2124:18,	1996:24, 1996:25,	1989:9, 1989:17,	tests [1] - 2130:22
summarizes [1] -	2126:14	1997:9, 1997:22,	1995:19, 2018:9,	text [3] - 1973:6,
2102:11	surprise [2] - 1992:3,	1999:15, 1999:16,	2038:24, 2039:10,	1994:12, 2000:8
summary [2] -	2032:11	1999:19, 2000:2,	2041:9, 2071:1,	THE [34] - 1925:1,
2110:18, 2111:4	surrounded [1] -	2000:5, 2000:8,	2074:20, 2087:16,	1927:18, 1927:24,
Summer [11] -	2042:17	2000:18, 2000:22,	2099.12 2118.14	1927:25, 1928:4
1022:10 1067:7	SURVAY [1] - 2035:20	2001:8.2001:14	2138.11 2144.3	2040.25 2079.22
1955.10, 1967.7,	Survey [1] - 2000.20	2001.22 2002.4	2145:1 2145:6	2040.20, 2070.22,
1967:16, 2017:9,	Survey [3] - 2043.5,	2053:3 2060:18	2145.1, 2145.0,	2091.4, 2099.10,
2050:3, 2061:13,	2043:18, 2088:22	2000.10,	2145.8, 2140.7,	2100:0, 2100:10,
2076:22, 2089:24,	Sutcliffe [1] - 1951:20	2060:24, 2062:12,	2147:4	2100:24, 2101:4,
2104:8, 2104:11,	swear [2] - 1927:20,	2064:9, 2064:20,	territory [1] - 2142:6	2101:23, 2102:5,
2104:14	2106:15	2072:4, 2072:7,	test [1] - 2132:19	2102:10, 2102:19,
summers [1] - 2096:5	switch [1] - 1957:10	2072:8, 2072:15,	testified [8] - 1950:8,	2102:21, 2103:1,
summertime [2] -	switched [1] - 1956:9	2073:10, 2073:22,	1993:2, 2017:22,	2103:16, 2103:21,
2095.17 2104.14	switching [1] - 1957:6	2074:4, 2074:9,	2032:25, 2097:4,	2104:4, 2104:21,
sun 121 - 2058:15	sworn [1] - 2107:9	2074:14, 2075:10,	2117:11 2117:17	2104:25, 2105:15,
2104:9	sworm [1] - 2107.3	2075:11, 2075:12,	2147.21	2106:13, 2106:19
2104.0 Com dia man. 4007.0	System [14] - 1930.25,	2075:13, 2075:19,	tostify 121 2032:20	2106:20 2106:24
Sunding [7] - 1967:2,	1941:7, 1941:13,	2075 22 2075 23	2050:40	2145:25, 2146:5
1967:5, 2016:16,	1941:22, 1944:19,	2088:24 2000:8	2059.19	2145.25, 2146.5,
2097:8, 2098:1,	1944:22, 1944:25,	2000.24, 2000.0,	testifying [1] -	2140.13, 2140.10,
2098:6, 2098:18	1946:23, 1947:20,	2090.9, 2090.10,	2065:21	2147:14
Sunding's [3] -	1948:11, 2041:9,	2090:21, 2091:12,	testimony [76] -	themselves [2] -
1967:14, 2016:20,	2095:2, 2105:9,	2092:10, 2100:7,	1927:20, 1928:8,	1947:8, 2050:5
2099:5	2139:10	2100:11, 2100:12,	1928:14, 1928:15,	therefore [5] - 1949:6,
sunlight [1] - 2058-15	System [2] - 1948:7	2100:25, 2101:1,	1942:18, 1962:1,	1972:10, 2019:4,
superceded [2] -	1948.9	2102:11, 2103:2,	1963:17. 1963:25.	2059:10, 2082:10
	system's [4] 1045:15	2106:7, 2115:14	1972 16 1974 4	thinking [1] - 2065:8
2030.9, 2030.14	system s[1] - 1940.10	tables [1] - 2100:9	1977.21 1977.22	third [4] - 1986.11
superior [4] - 1951:8,		tags [1] - 2136:9	1077:25 1079:5	2032:17 2080:9
1958:20, 1960:3,	2049:25, 2066:2	talks [1] - 1948:20	1977.23, 1978.3,	2002.17, 2000.3,
1960:12	systems [9] - 2081:25,	talks [1] = 1040.20	1978:15, 1980.5,	2143.12
superseded [2] -	2117:12, 2117:18,	tan [1] - 2047.10	1981:14, 1983:5,	thousands [5] -
2036:24, 2037:6	2132:15, 2140:3,	tandem [1] - 1948:23	1986:13, 1986:16,	1962:21, 1963:5,
supplement [1] -	2140:14, 2140:16,	target [3] - 2092:15,	1988:5, 1990:15,	2010:24, 2072:14,
2109:25	2140:17, 2141:4	2092:18, 2092:23	1990:24, 1992:25,	2089:23
supplemental [4] -		targets [1] - 2090:17	1993:9, 1994:5,	three [15] - 1943:5,
1997:11.2031:21	т	team [2] - 2025:15,	1995:21, 1996:24,	1945:13, 1946:20,
2112:22 2113:1	•	2027:1	1997:15, 1997:21,	1953:4, 1971:3,
eupply 101 2120-E	tab [10] - 1946:2,	technical [4] -	1999:23, 2000:22.	1986:10, 1998:3.
3uppiy [2] - 2130.3,	1946:15, 1947:22,	2065:25. 2080:6	2001:1. 2002:12	2021:3. 2051:6
2137.17	1948:5, 1968:8.	2080:10 2146:18	2004:10 2013:12	2085:11 2085:12
support [3] - 2026:1,	1972:18, 1975:14	technique (4) -	2013:25 2015:10	2100.21 2110.16
2027:23, 2033:9	1975.16 1975.22	2060:16	2010.20, 2010.10,	2100.21, 2110.10,
supported [1] -	1001.0, 1070.22,	2009.10	2010.7, 2017.1,	2132.19, 2130.20
1948:22	table 1071 1020-25	temperate [1] -	2010.3, 2018:25,	uiree-pronged [1] -
supporting [2] -	lable [87] - 1928:23,	2104:12	2021:18, 2021:21,	2132:19
	4000-0 4007 40		0021-22 2022-10	threshold (3) -
2000:22, 2036:25	1929:2, 1937:12,	temperature [3] -	2021.22, 2022.10,	
2000:22, 2036:25 supposed [4] -	1929:2, 1937:12, 1937:13, 1938:5,	temperature [3] - 2006:10, 2058:14,	2023:14, 2023:23,	1971:24, 2051:23,
2000:22, 2036:25 supposed [4] - 2072:25, 2087:11	1929:2, 1937:12, 1937:13, 1938:5, 1938:7, 1938:17,	temperature [3] - 2006:10, 2058:14, 2061:24	2023:14, 2023:23, 2025:11, 2030:16,	1971:24, 2051:23, 2051:24
2000:22, 2036:25 supposed [4] - 2072:25, 2087:11, 2089:3, 2125:1	1929:2, 1937:12, 1937:13, 1938:5, 1938:7, 1938:17, 1938:20, 1938:24,	temperature [3] - 2006:10, 2058:14, 2061:24 temperatures [1] -	2021:22, 2022:10, 2023:14, 2023:23, 2025:11, 2030:16, 2032:16, 2034:18,	1971:24, 2051:23, 2051:24 thresholds [2] -
2000:22, 2036:25 supposed [4] - 2072:25, 2087:11, 2089:3, 2125:1 Suprome (4) - 2126:7	1929:2, 1937:12, 1937:13, 1938:5, 1938:7, 1938:17, 1938:20, 1938:24, 1939:2, 1939:3,	temperature [3] - 2006:10, 2058:14, 2061:24 temperatures [1] - 2061:13	2021:22, 2022:10, 2023:14, 2023:23, 2025:11, 2030:16, 2032:16, 2034:18, 2036:25, 2056:13,	1971:24, 2051:23, 2051:24 thresholds [2] - 2056:20, 2057:21
2000:22, 2036:25 supposed [4] - 2072:25, 2087:11, 2089:3, 2125:1 Supreme [1] - 2126:7	1929:2, 1937:12, 1937:13, 1938:5, 1938:7, 1938:17, 1938:20, 1938:24, 1939:2, 1939:3, 1939:6, 1939:13	temperature [3] - 2006:10, 2058:14, 2061:24 temperatures [1] - 2061:13	2021:22, 2022:10, 2023:14, 2023:23, 2025:11, 2030:16, 2032:16, 2034:18, 2036:25, 2056:13, POILE:18, 2097:9,	1971:24, 2051:23, 2051:24 thresholds [2] - 2056:20, 2057:21 throughout [3] -
2000:22, 2036:25 supposed [4] - 2072:25, 2087:11, 2089:3, 2125:1 Supreme [1] - 2126:7 SUPREME [1] -	1929:2, 1937:12, 1937:13, 1938:5, 1938:7, 1938:17, 1938:20, 1938:24, 1939:2, 1939:3, 1939:6, 1939:13 THI	temperature [3] - 2006:10, 2058:14, 2061:24 temperatures [1] - 2061:13 E REPORTING GI	2021:22, 2022:10, 2023:14, 2023:23, 2025:11, 2030:16, 2032:16, 2034:18, 2036:25, 2056:13, ROUP :18, 2097:9,	1971:24, 2051:23, 2051:24 thresholds [2] - 2056:20, 2057:21 throughout [3] -

2136:25, 2137:8,	2142:20	1986:11, 1986:12,	umbrellas [1] -	2112:11, 2119:6,
2138:23	totally [2] - 2052:22.	1997:4, 2000:16,	2148:16	2135:4, 2140:12,
timing [1] - 2102:14	2082:15	2002:12, 2003:15,	unavailable [1] -	2140:22, 2142:15
title [1] - 2085:10	toward [1] - 1984:15	2005:17, 2017:5,	2143:17	up-to-date [3] -
today [13] - 1929:3,	track [10] - 2058:10,	2021:21, 2027:6,	unconventional [1] -	2034:23, 2035:1,
1997:20, 2052:23,	2058:12, 2059:6,	2028:12, 2036:2,	2013:19	2035:13
2053:3, 2056:3,	2060:9, 2066:23,	2036:4, 2050:15,	under [26] - 1931:8,	update [2] - 1946:12,
2056:13, 2063:22,	2070:13, 2070:14,	2052:2, 2055:12,	1933:1, 1933:9,	2141:9
2095:15, 2099:14,	2070:15, 2070:19	2060:16, 2066:16,	1934:2, 1934:3,	updated [6] - 1957:17,
2107:9, 2120:25,	tracks [1] - 1953:10	2072:3, 2074:4,	1934:4, 1934:7,	1957:21, 1958:6,
2121:7, 2147:17	transcript [9] -	2079:25, 2080:5,	1934:13, 1940:19,	1958:19, 2016:16,
together [6] - 1943:5,	1942:25, 1943:14,	2080:9, 2082:16,	1940:23, 1943:9,	2035:11
1976:4, 2050:16,	1947:10, 1955:1,	2086:16, 2088:10,	1948:9, 1952:11,	upper [2] - 2041:18,
2072:7, 2080:23,	2013:2, 2025:12,	2089:25, 2093:14,	1961:5, 1961:15,	2046:10
2118:16	2027:6, 2039:23,	2095:18, 2097:17,	1963:14, 1964:10,	upstream [11] -
tomorrow [1] - 2148:8	2149:5	2099:22, 2115:7,	1964:19, 1964:22,	1948:22, 1949:15,
took [9] - 1965:19,	IRANSCRIPT [1] -	2120.4	1965:3, 1982:22,	1950:5, 1950:6,
1976:8, 1991:12,	1925:9	turning $(1) - 2101217$	2001:8, 2036:7,	1989:21, 1990:3,
2045:18, 2054:14,	transters [2] -	1078-12 1082-24	2115:19, 2133:14, 2144:25	1991:6, 1992:20,
2059:24, 2128:23,	1932:16, 1969:13	1970.12, 1902.21, 2071.12, 2002.25	2144:25	2038:22, 2094:8,
2135:3, 2141:10	translates [1] - 1989:3	2071.12, 2092.20 twice [1] - 21/0:0	1052-11	2095:4
1001 [4] - 2066:20,	transpiration [3] -	two (201, 1020-22	1902.11	urpan [2] - 2143:18, 2142:10
2007:25, 2070:19, 2003:24	2049:14, 2049:17,	1040.8 1051.15	2070-11	2140.19
2090.24	2058:19	1940.0, 1901.10, 1954.21 1967.22		2062:22 2074:6
10015 [4] - 2029:5,	transpose [1] -	1968:6 1968:13	1076-0 1009-12	2002.22, 2074.0
2000.19,2007.20, 2068.7	20/0:21	1985.21 1993.3	1970.9, 1990.10, 2011/20 2011/22	user [4] - ∠1∠1.10, 2132-22 2123-22
2000.7	traveled [1] - 2088:1	1994.6 1995.1	2014.20, 2014.22, 2017:7-2010:18	∠132.22, 2133.23, 2137·18
1953.1 1082.20	2003-0	1995:24. 2006:21		2107.10 IISARS (6) - 2118.10
2000:3 2010:11	2033.3 trial (1) - 2082.21	2008:23. 2013:10.	2132:14	2118·11 2110·16
2056.21 2061.5	tributarios (4) 2052.0	2021:3, 2048:23.	unit (1) - 2141.25	2132.15 2133.22
2068:24 2085:13	tributarius [1] - 2002.9	2051:17, 2061:1,	UNITED 111 - 1925-1	2138:10
2085:14. 2127:8	1080.21,	2061:2, 2063:23,	United [3] - 1930-4	uses [5] - 1930-11
2143:4	trickle (4) - 2054-22	2064:2, 2085:17,	2043:18, 2043:20	1930:18. 2063:5
topic [8] - 1970:7.	tried [2] - 2004.20	2085:22, 2093:16,	University [2] -	2074:17. 2118:8
2021:18, 2025:11,	2146·19	2097:23, 2098:2,	2059:18, 2135:14	USGS [24] - 1972:25
2060:5, 2093:14,	frue [12] - 1995-4	2111:1, 2112:6,	unreasonable 111 -	1975:7, 1976:7.
2096:3, 2114:19,	2008;7, 2025:1	2117:4, 2117:5,	2034:22	1977:11, 1979:16,
2120:24	2025:3. 2095:8	2117:6, 2118:7,	up [49] - 1928:1,	2007:3, 2007:4,
Torak [31] - 2024:9,	2117:21, 2118:1.	2118:15, 2127:2,	1928:21, 1929:7,	2007:7, 2007:18,
2024:13, 2024:16,	2118:20, 2119:9.	2132:5, 2139:19,	1931:12, 1933:17,	2024:10, 2033:24,
2024:21, 2024:25,	2121:10, 2125:10	2145:20	1939:11, 1951:11,	2035:5, 2035:14,
2025:4, 2025:9,	truth [7] - 1927:22,	two-way [1] - 2085:22	1953:4, 1956:14,	2043:17, 2048:1,
2029:16, 2029:22,	1927:23, 1943:11,	type [4] - 1947:19,	1957:13, 1970:24,	2050:22, 2054:18,
2029:25, 2030:5,	2106:17, 2106:18	2051:23, 2131:4,	1971:1, 1975:4,	2057:3, 2057:7,
2030:9, 2031:11,	try [5] - 2018:12,	2133:17	1988:19, 2004:3,	2058:2, 2058:4,
2033:21, 2033:24,	2070:11, 2130:10,	types [2] - 2064:2,	2005:19, 2026:7,	2062:15, 2076:6
2034:2, 2034:5,	2133:1, 2144:12	2139:25	2034:23, 2035:1,	USGS's [1] - 2007:14
2034:9, 2034:11,	trying [6] - 1936:19,	typical [1] - 2069:20	2035:13, 2042:1,	utilities [2] - 2138:5,
2034:13, 2035:8,	2077:25, 2106:4,	upically [6] - 1949:6,	2044:10, 2044:11,	2138:8
2035:11, 2035:15,	2120:22, 2132:10,	2043.14,2047.25, 2068:1 2002:22	2044:16, 2046:17,	utility [1] - 2137:18
2000.22, 2000.12, 2036.12, 2026.15	2136:13	2000.4, 2003.22, 2101·25	2048:16, 2049:15,	
2030.13, 2030.15, 2036-10, 2037-7	Tuesday [1] - 2148:9	2101.25	2053:24, 2055:15, 2060:17, 2072:5	V
2000.19,2007.7	turn [46] - 1937:9,	11	2000.17, 2072.5,	vaguely [1] - 1998:16
1034.15 1034.0,	1937:11, 1943:13,	U	2014.1, 2010.1, 2076.10 2078.20	value [11] - 1966:18.
1939.23 1972.21,	1946:15, 1947:9,	U.S [7] - 2043:5,	2070.19, 2070.20, 2079:8-2070:10	1969:6, 2006:22,
1977:17 1989.7	1954:25, 1965:18,	2080:18, 2080:24,	2013.0, 2013.10, 2085.1 2003.13	2006:23, 2051:12,
2111:21, 2112:15	19/2:15, 1972:19,	2081:14, 2083:5,	2000.1, 2000.10, 2102.1 2104.12	2051:16, 2051:21,
2134:14, 2134:25	1977:24, 1978:17, 1070:10, 4000:4, UUT	20088-22 2141-8 2 DEDODUTNO OT	2102.1, 2104.12,	2054:15, 2054:16,
,,,	1979:19, 1982:1 THI	' REFURITING GI	NUUE, 2112.0,	2079:6
	M	ason & Lockha	rt	

values (42) 1030-13		2073-8 2078-8	woird (4) 2080-2	2146.5 2146.13
107/10 10701	W	2073.8, 2078.8, 2078.11	wellomo (4)	2140.3, 2140.13, 2146.16, 2147.14
1974.10, 1979.1, 1070:3 1007:7	wait [2] - 1985:14.	2070.10, 2073.11,	2052:25 2001:0	2140.10, 2147.14,
2000.12 2047.25	2099:2	2002.0, 2002.10,	2032.23, 2091.9,	Witness (4) - 1026.2
2051:15, 2088:25	walk [4] - 1958:10.	2005:3, 2002:10, 2095:4, 2096:12	well-accepted [4] -	witness [1] - 1020.2
2001:10, 2000:20, 2005:3	2045:13, 2054:21,	2000:4, 2000:12, 2009:20	2050-23	1027·1/ 1028·7
2105:3 2133:20	2112:7	2105.1 2105.9	woll recognized (4)	1927.14, 1920.7, 1929:6 1945:24
variability 111 -	walked [5] - 1934:5,	2109.7, 2111.22	2050-22	1945:25 1972:16
2063.19	1935:8, 1939:9,	2112:15, 2117:22	wolls M - 2114-16	1972.18 1975.10
variable [2] - 2068-17	1960:20, 2018:16	2119:17, 2121:12	2117.23 2137.7	1975:16, 2052:13
2074·16	Walter [1] - 1945:14	2122:1. 2122:4.	2117.25, 2157.7, 2141.15	2107:12, 2108:14
variety [1] - 1933:1	Walton [2] - 2140:22,	2122:7, 2122:9,	West [1] - 1945·14	2120:7. 2127:5.
various (5) - 2056:20	2140:25	2122:15, 2122:16,	west [1] - 2005:2	2147:24
2057:20, 2059:8	wants [1] - 2078:9	2122:22, 2123:16,	wet (g) - 1999:3	witnesses [2] -
2133:11, 2136:21	Washington [1] -	2123:21, 2123:24,	1999.6 1999.9	2147:21, 2147:22
vast [1] - 1973-15	2059:18	2124:13, 2124:16,	2021.1 2021.6	wonderful [1] - 2148:6
vegetative [1] -	water [150] - 1932:24,	2124:21, 2126:14,	2021.9 2022.4	wondering [1] -
2058:25	1937:5, 1937:15,	2127:16, 2129:24,	2039:3 2054:20	2047:7
velocity [1] - 2047:19	1937:19, 1937:24,	2130:3, 2130:12,	wetland 121 - 2121.17	Woodruff [23] -
verbatim [1] - 2028:18	1938:25, 1939:4,	2130:16, 2131:23,	2134:2	1948:22, 1949:12.
verify [3] - 2014.10	1940:10, 1945:9,	2132:3, 2133:13,	wetlands [1] - 2086-4	1953:18, 1962:13,
2026:18. 2026:23	1946:12, 1946:17,	2133:16, 2134:12,	WHEREOF 111 -	1962:16, 1962:21,
version [5] - 2010:4.	1946:24, 1948:16,	2134:14, 2134:20,	2149:10	1964:4, 1964:13,
2083:16, 2083:19,	1962:15, 1962:17,	2134:25, 2136:23,	whole [9] - 1927:22.	1964:20, 1965:1,
2083:22, 2083:24	1963:15, 1967:6,	2137:25, 2138:9,	2043:6. 2046:6.	1966:6, 1966:12,
versus [6] - 1971:7.	1972:6, 1972:10,	2138:16, 2139:24,	2063:16. 2086:5.	1966:20, 1967:10,
1993:15. 2077:7.	1978:19, 1978:21,	2142:18, 2142:21,	2106:17, 2110:16.	1967:17, 1968:24,
2095:1, 2103:5,	1978:23, 1978:25,	2142:23, 2144:6,	2122:22, 2144:14	1969:3, 1969:18,
2144:4	1979:11, 1987:8,	2145:2, 2145:9	wide [2] - 2054:20,	1970:3, 1983:14,
vertical [2] - 2044:7,	1987:12, 1987:25,	Water [7] - 2108:22,	2122:21	1988:22, 1988:23,
2077:7	1988:23, 1989:24,	2123:15, 2125:11,	Wildlife [4] - 2080:18,	2046:20
viable [1] - 2114:4	1990:5, 1995:11,	2128:2, 2129:11,	2080:24, 2081:2,	word [9] - 2017:17,
VIC [2] - 2068:18,	2002:15, 2009:23,	2130:4, 2138:15	2081:14	2031:19, 2032:23,
2074:16	2010:1, 2018:22,	waters [2] - 2049:7,	wildly [1] - 2095:3	2043:9, 2067:25,
video [7] - 1943:16,	2019:11, 2022:21,	2125:2	winded [1] - 2148:3	2081:11, 2081:18,
1947:13, 1955:4,	2022:25, 2023:8,	watershed [1] -	WINE [1] - 1925:17	2099:16, 2121:11
1959:5, 2013:5,	2023:10, 2024:7,	2062:22	Winn [1] - 2107:20	words [7] - 1966:9,
2027:10, 2040:1	2027:10, 2030:11,	watersned [1] -	winter [1] - 2104:11	2026:24, 2043:7,
view [2] - 2128:4,	2037.10, 2037.14,	2071:3	withdraw [2] -	2064:20, 2077:14,
2128:9	2038.10, 2030.10, 2038.24, 2030.11	ways [4] - 2038.14,	2121:12, 2144:16	2087:7, 2095:23
viewed [1] - 1948:11	2030.24, 2039.11,	2009:0, 2092:1,	withdrawal [1] -	works [2] - 2041:9,
VIII [1] - 1925:5	2041.8 2041.13	2109.24 woathor (2) 2038:18	2133:25	2138:23
Vinyard [1] - 2128:24	2041.17 2041.18	$21/8 \cdot 1/4 = 21/8 \cdot 1/5$	withdrawals [7] -	WORID [2] - 2068:25,
violated [3] - 2093:5,	2043:12, 2047:20,	2140.14, 2140.13	1932:9, 2117:22,	2009.1
2093:8, 2093:12	2047:21, 2047:23,	webs [1] - 2003.1	2118:4, 2124:12,	written (41) 1029:14
violating [1] - 2089:20	2049:14, 2049:20,	1976.7 1979.17	2126:15, 2126:17,	1028-15 2002-21
violation [2] - 2089:7,	2049:21, 2058:10,	2057.8 2059.22	2126:20	1926.15, 2002.21, 2025:5, 2028:1
2138:7	2058:11, 2058:20,	2062:20	WITNESS [29] -	2028:5 2107:23
volume [9] - 1931:7,	2059:2, 2059:5,	week [7] - 2055:13.	1927:24, 1928:4,	2020:0, 2107:20, 2114:25, 2117:10
1947:23, 2021:19,	2059:6, 2059:7,	2059:19. 2065:21.	2079:22, 2091:4,	2125:17, 2133:3
2028:11, 2036:3,	2059:13, 2060:8,	2076:23, 2148:10,	2099:16, 2100:6,	wrote [4] - 2110:11
2043:11, 2113:11,	2060:10, 2060:11,	2148:11	∠100.10, ∠100:24, 2101:4, 2101:22	2127:9. 2127:12.
Z113.Z1, Z114:Z	2064:16, 2065:9,	week-and-a-half [1] -	2101.4, 2101.23, 2102:5-2102:40	2127:15
	2066:22, 2066:24,	2055:13	2102.3, 2102.10, 2102.10, 2102.20	
2100.7	2066:25, 2070:6,	weekend [2] -	2102.13, 2102.21,	X
voluntary 101 - 0102.2	2070:8, 2070:9,	2148:15, 2148:21	2103:21, 2104-4	
2123·10	2070:12, 2070:16,	weeks [2] - 1997:16,	2104:21, 2104:25	XLSX [2] - 2056:9,
2120.10	2070:20, 2070:22,	2013:15	2105:15. 2106:19.	2056:10
	2070:24, 2071:6	E REPORTING G	ROUP :24, 2145:25.	
	2012.22, 2012.2	I	· · ·	
	N	iason & Lockha	rr	

Y	2048:17, 2051:10,	
vear [36] - 1933:25.	2003.11, 2009.0,	
1934 16 1934 22	vellow colored w	
1935:3, 1937:6	2003-0	
1938:1, 1941:14.	viold (201 1071.14	
1941:19, 1978:23	1006:1 1006:2	
1978:24, 1978:25,	1990.1, 1990.3,	
1979:10 1979:11	1990.7, 1990.14,	
1999:19, 2009:23	1990.19, 1997.1,	
2010:1. 2010:4.	1007:10 1007:12	
2027:17. 2030:12.	1997.10, 1997.12, 1007:17 1007:24	
2049:3. 2060:25.	1008.8 1008.18	
2061:8, 2062:7,	1008.10 1000.8	
2077:7, 2084:16,	1000.13, 1000.17	
2101:15, 2101:19,	1000.10 1000.20	
2102:9, 2102:11,	2000.3 2000.12	
2102:23, 2103:15,	2000.3, 2000.12, 2000.24	
2103:17, 2103:22,	2000.24, 2001.3,	
2109:17, 2116:20	2001.12, 2001.10, 2002.1	
year-round [1] -	2132.6	
2103:17	vields 121 - 2000.5	
years [75] - 1935:19,	2000.9	
1938:5, 1942:7,	York [1] - 1928-23	
1954:7, 1955:21,	vourself [7] - 1928-1	
1957:23, 1957:25,	2008.5 2008.12	
1958:4, 1959:11,	2057:13 2062:3	
1959:14, 1960:1,	2095:25, 2106:21	
1960:10, 1973:4,	,	
1974:19, 1974:22,	7	
1975:1, 1978:19,		
1978:21, 1980:15,	zero [23] - 1933:23,	
1980:21, 1982:5,	1934:6, 1934:15,	
1992:4, 1994:7,	1934:20, 1935:2,	
1998:24, 1999:3,	1952:14, 1952:17,	
1999:6, 1999:10,	1953:9, 1953:24,	
2000:2, 2017:10,	1956:2, 1959:23,	
2019:25, 2020:4,	1960:8, 1961:19,	
2021:1, 2021:3,	1902.7, 1902.9,	
2021:0, 2021:8,	1991.10, 1992.2,	
2021.9, 2021.13,	2010:13 2055:2	
2022.3, 2022.4,	2010:10, 2000:2,	
2029.10, 2033.17, 2035.3	zone [1] - 2104·12	
2030.3, 2040.3,	2010[1] - 2104.12	
2048:25 2057:23		
2060:21, 2061:1		
2061:2. 2061:3.		
2061:12, 2061:14.		
2062:10, 2065:14,		
2065:17, 2071:2,		
2072:9, 2073:23,		
2075:16, 2075:18,		
2077:13, 2077:15,		
2077:18, 2082:2,		
2087:8, 2112:6,		
2132:5, 2132:9		
yellow [13] - 1983:22,		
1984:9, 2003:4,		
2017:13, 2048:5,	ויזיח	
2048:6, 2048:8,	1 HI	L ALFORITING GROUP
	N N	lason & Lockhart