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|  | 2187 |  | 2189 |
| 1 | Court to look at the schedule for Georgia's | 1 | MR. PERRY: This particular clip is |
| 2 | witnesses and to try to economize and be | 2 | Florida Exhibit 881. |
| 3 | concise for the weeks after that. | 3 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 4 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good. | 4 | MR. PERRY: And this is FX-23. |
| 5 | MR. PERRY: Okay. So, your Honor, if I | 5 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 6 | might, I would like to start with the | 6 | MR. PERRY: And, likewise, here we're on |
| 7 | deposition testimony of Mr. Wisniewski. | 7 | Florida Exhibit 23. |
| 8 | And if I might approach, I will hand | 8 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 9 | out -- | 9 | MR. PERRY: We're still here, your |
| 10 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. | 10 | Honor, on Florida Exhibit 23. |
| 11 | MR. PERRY: -- the binders. | 11 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 12 | So, your Honor, as we have in the past, | 12 | MR. PERRY: This clip, your Honor, |
| 13 | this particular testimony is on behalf of | 13 | remains on Florida Exhibit 23. |
| 14 | both parties. So we are playing both our | 14 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 15 | designations and Georgia's cross-designations | 15 | MR. PERRY: So the next group of clips |
| 16 | at the same time. | 16 | relates to Florida Exhibit 97. And I'll note |
| 17 | It's on the screen, and we start in the | 17 | that on Florida Exhibit 97, there are some |
| 18 | first several clips with the witness's | 18 | redactions because there are specific |
| 19 | background. | 19 | locations identified for endangered mussels |
| 20 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 20 | in the State of Georgia. |
| 21 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, as you might | 21 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 22 | have heard there, one of the counsel had a | 22 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, this next clip |
| 23 | cold, so I apologize for the sound quality. | 23 | continues to relate Florida Exhibit 97. The |
| 24 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: That's fine. | 24 | specific focal point is the page GA 931314. |
| 25 | MR. PERRY: So the next set of clips THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | (Whereupon the video was played.) THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
|  | 2188 |  | 2190 |
| 1 | have to do with Georgia's endangered species | 1 | MR. PERRY: This next clip remains on |
| 2 | project statement, which is Florida Exhibit | 2 | Florida Exhibit 97. It's the same page, GA |
| 3 | 104. | 3 | 931314, a little bit up the page. |
| 4 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 4 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 5 | MR. PERRY: Now, this clip continues to | 5 | MR. PERRY: The next clip relates to two |
| 6 | address Florida Exhibit 104, and the | 6 | documents. One is Florida Exhibit 882, and |
| 7 | particular page is GA 724353. | 7 | the other is Florida Exhibit 42. The first |
| 8 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 8 | particular entry here is on 882. |
| 9 | MR. PERRY: Next, your Honor, we go to | 9 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 10 | Florida Exhibit 99, and the clip relates to a | 10 | MR. PERRY: Now, the next series of |
| 11 | presentation by Mr. Wisniewski titled Impacts | 11 | clips actually relate to the Peterson study, |
| 12 | of Federally Listed Mussels to Georgia. | 12 | and that's Florida Exhibit 42. |
| 13 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 13 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 14 | MR. PERRY: This clip is, likewise, | 14 | MR. PERRY: This next clip continues to |
| 15 | Florida Exhibit 99. The page number is GA | 15 | relate Florida Exhibit 42. |
| 16 | 1284553. | 16 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 17 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 17 | MR. PERRY: Still on Florida Exhibit 42, |
| 18 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, the next set of | 18 | your Honor. |
| 19 | testimony -- and there are a number of clips | 19 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 20 | here relating to Joint Exhibit 21 -- that's | 20 | MR. PERRY: And, again, we're on Florida |
| 21 | the 2006 plan that we talked about -- Florida | 21 | Exhibit 42 here, page 110. |
| 22 | Exhibit 881 and Florida Exhibit 23. This | 22 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 23 | particular clip is the Joint Exhibit 21, the | 23 | MR. PERRY: Still on Exhibit FX-42, your |
| 24 | 2006 plan. | 24 | Honor. |
| 25 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 25 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
|  | Mason \& Lockhart |  | Mason \& Lockhart |



Georgia's part of the ACF Basin since the time of FX-5, which is dated April 16, 1999. Okay?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Could you please turn with me to tab 7 of your binder, which is Florida Exhibit 878. Do you recognize tab 7 ?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And that's a report on a data run from Georgia's agricultural permitting database. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see the name at the bottom, T. Coppage?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you describe who that is?
A. Tammy Coppage is a data analyst in our agricultural permitting unit.
Q. Did you request that she do this analysis?
A. I did not request it. I did receive it from the permitting unit.
Q. And you believe the numbers on this page FX-878 to be an accurate depiction as of the time this was run; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. I would like to talk a little bit about the numbers that can be obtained from the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
agricultural permitting database year after year after year since the 1999 moratorium. We have actually used the agricultural permitting database, which is at Joint Exhibit 132, to do such a run. And I would invite your attention, if I might, to tab 8, please, where you will find a demonstrative and a date accomplished.

So what I would like to do, if I could, Dr. Cowie, is walk through some key dates from your prefiled testimony using the data and material on -- at tab 8, the demonstrative.

MR. PERRY: And if I could, I'm going to, your Honor, try to actually mark on the electronic copy on this on the screen, if I could.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. I'm going to first ask you about -- I didn't do a very good job of making that mark; but it's the moratorium in 1999 that you referred to a moment ago. Do you recall that that moratorium began in roughly November of 1999; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you see on the exhibit at tab 8 that there are quite a number of permits granted after the time of that moratorium?
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## A. Yes.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, I'm just going to simply note for the record that Florida asked for the courtesy of when there were going to be demonstratives used from large compiled databases, that we provide it to them, which we did. That was not reciprocated. So Dr. Cowie hasn't seen this before, and neither have I. But we'll do our best to answer the questions that Mr. Perry has.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, counsel.

MR. PERRY: I might respond that we're engaging in the same course of conduct that we have seen in the last few days.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. So let's start, if we could, at 1999. And if we look down the row -- the columns, do you see number of permits there?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you see acres beside it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So have you endeavored to do this type of THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart analysis yourself?
A. I have not, and so I'm trying to understand. Let me just make sure $I$ 'm understanding what's shown here. These are numbers of permits issued in a year, and these are the permitted acres associated with those permits. Is that what this table shows?
Q. That's exactly right. And it's consistent with the exhibit by Ms. Coppage at tab 7.

So if we could take a look here, in your prefiled direct testimony you first mentioned 1999 as a year when Director Reheis instituted a moratorium. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you see, as you read across from 1999, that there were quite a number of permits and permitted acres associated with 2000. In other words, the permits were issued that year. Do you see 104,000 acres there?
A. Yes.
Q. And as you read down, do you see there's quite a bit of permitting going on even up to 2006, which is another relevant time period in your prefiled direct testimony. Right?
A. Yes.
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A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you see this is a permit for irrigation in Spring Creek?
A. In the Spring Creek watershed, yes.
Q. Using drawing from the Floridan Aquifer, do you see that in the second paragraph?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Could you turn with me to the second page of that permit, please.

And under Standard Conditions, do you see the second item, Use Limitations?
A. Yes.
Q. And an indication that the use of groundwater is limited to the quantity and purpose specified in this permit?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see that?

Now, if you could look down the page with me to Revocability, do you see that?
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## 2208

A. Yes.
Q. And at C it reads, noncompliance with any condition of this permit.

You agree with me, don't you, that it's within EPD's authority to revoke permits for agricultural irrigation for noncompliance with acreage limits. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Could you turn with me, please, to tab 14. And I -- I would invite your attention to the last line on tab 14 . These are examples, only 30 of the 2,500 examples of unpermitted irrigation acres. But that last line is labeled
A-98-100-0564. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you could page back to tab 13 , which is Exhibit FX-312, do you see that's the permit number of the particular permit we were looking at?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Now, if you could with me, please, run your eyes across the page -- and I'm going to try to draw again with my finger on the screen. Do you see where it says total wetted acreage, 134 ?
A. Yes.
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Q. And then unpermitted acres, 34?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Have you ever seen this particular document we're looking at?
A. I have not.
Q. Okay. Now, are you -- do you have any understanding of how many acres in Spring Creek these 2,500 illegal permits may affect?
A. I have no information on that. I do know that there is a step that needs to be taken to -- as I said, these wetted -- this wetted acre database is a snapshot in time. The agricultural permitting database gets updated on a very regular basis. So there is a step that needs to be taken to identify and resolve any discrepancies between those --
Q. Yes.
A. -- to ensure that there isn't information that -some of these changes may have been in the pipeline -- some of the changes may have been in the pipeline, that would mean some of these are in compliance, not necessarily aren't. Like, maybe a portion of them; I don't know. But I don't know -- I don't have the kind of details you're talking about. I haven't seen this THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## information before.

Q. And on Thursday, Dr. Sunding can explain how he looked at both databases to compile this information.
A. But that -- the point is one database changes regularly. The other is a snapshot, and it doesn't change regularly. So looking at both is not going to address that problem.
Q. Do you know when the wetted acreage database was produced to Florida in this case?
A. I do not.
Q. In February? Do you know that?
A. I do not know.
Q. Okay. So let's, if we could, please go to tab 16.

And I'm sorry to say, this is a little bit challenging to read because the type is so small. But this is an organization chart for the Environmental Protection Division. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And do you see your name in the upper left corner there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I would like to focus just for a
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|  |
| --- |

Q. How many of those permits are there?
A. I don't have a precise number. It's less than 30.
Q. Less than 30 out of 8,000 permits in the basin?
A. I don't believe there are 8,000 permits in the basin, but it's less than 30.
Q. It's less than one-half of 1 percent of all the permits in the basin?
A. It's a very small number, yes.
Q. Okay. So those permits in particular are meant when a specific low flow is meant to cut off irrigation as to those particular surface water users; is that correct?
A. Could you repeat that? I'm sorry.
Q. Sure. Let's focus for a moment on the 25 percent average annual discharge requirement, and I want to make sure that we understand exactly what that is. So for these less than 30 surface water permits, those individuals are not allowed to irrigate. They must stop pumping water from rivers when flows get to 25 percent of average annual discharge; is that correct?
A. That's the low flow threshold applied to those new permits in those watersheds. For other permits, the older permits, they have a different THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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low flow threshold. It is lower, but they do have a low flow threshold unless they're a very small stream.
Q. And you're referring to a lower flow threshold than 7Q10?
A. That's correct.
Q. And how many permits have 7 Q 10 as a low flow threshold?
A. I don't have that number.
Q. We believe it's about 64.
A. If that's from the electronic database, that will not reflect the permits. They're in the paper files. Not all of those conditions have been entered into the electronic database --
Q. Okay.
A. -- which is partly why I don't have that number.
Q. Okay. Do you believe that number is more than 100?
A. I don't know. I don't have any estimate because of the paper file versus electronic file issue.
Q. And how old is the paper file?
A. It goes back to the start of the permitting program.
Q. All right. So can you turn with me, please, to FX-72.

THE REPORTING GROUP
A. Do you have a tab number, sir?
Q. Yes. It's tab 23.

And do you see there an e-mail from Cliff
Lewis?
A. I do.
Q. Do you see your name there?
A. Yes.
Q. Cliff Lewis is with the agricultural permitting unit; is that correct?
A. He manages that unit, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you see a number of U.S. gaging stations listed in the text of the e-mail?
A. Yes.
Q. And then a column for 25 percent AAD?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm going to show you a few gage readings just to see if the particular streams that we're talking about here are actually meeting the 25 percent AAD requirement we discussed. But the first is for permit 02353500 . It's about five entries down. Do you see that?
A. So it would be the gage numbers, not permit numbers.
Q. You're right. I made a mistake.
A. All right. Just to clarify. THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. It's gage number. Thank you for correcting me.

And this is in 2014 that this information is listed. Correct?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Do you see that number 2353500?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you turn with me to -- to tab 24. Now, on tab 24 -- you may recall this from your deposition -- we marked for the last eight or so years since the 2006 plan how frequently that 25 percent AAD requirement had been violated. You would agree with me, wouldn't you, that that happened very frequently in dry to drought years?
A. The -- there's a -- the violation word confuses me because a requirement is applied to individual water withdrawal permit holders. And so it means that when the streamflow drops below that level, they need to cease withdrawing. If they cease withdrawing, there is no violation.
Q. Okay.
A. It's not the streamflow itself that's a violation.
Q. Let me rephrase that question so we can talk about what's actually happening on this river.

So in every one of those yellow boxes you THE REPORTING GROUP
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complex systems; and it is -- we're taking responsible steps to understand how to implement these effectively.
Q. By studies?
A. Getting information is responsible as the first step to do this.
Q. Okay. Might I turn with you to Exhibit 33, please.

MR. PRIMIS: Tab or exhibit?
MR. PERRY: Yes, tab 33.
A. Yes, I'm there.
Q. And it's Exhibit FX-285. You have seen this before. Haven't you?
A. I have.
Q. And this is issued by American Rivers and Flint River. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you know Gordon Rogers; don't you?
A. I do.
Q. We have just looked at the plan for the Upper Flint a little bit ago from the Regional Water Council; and now I would like to look with you, please, at page 10 of this report. And do you see the reference to the Flint flows at the fall line suffering a 70 percent decline in the upper THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
right-hand paragraph of this report?
A. I do.
Q. Now, from time to time you have worked with Mr. Gordon Rogers; haven't you?
A. I have.
Q. And he's the Flint riverkeeper; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Has he ever expressed his view to you that EPD is the problem and not the solution to the Upper Flint issues?
A. I don't know if $I$ have heard it put in those terms.
Q. Have you ever attempted to work with him in the localities on these Upper Flint issues?
A. We -- the -- as -- after this report was published, American Rivers and Flint riverkeeper convened the water utilities in the basin to talk about next steps. EPD was initially invited to that meeting and then was disinvited.
Q. And you don't recall Mr. Rogers explaining to you why EPD was disinvited?
A. It was not Mr. Rogers who was contacting us. It was the American Rivers representative, Ben Emanuel. And he did explain to me why we were disinvited. They felt like it would be a more THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
productive discussion if the agency that regulated the water utilities was not in the room.

That group continues to meet to date, and we have spoken with both utilities and Mr. Rogers and Mr. Emanuel about the progress that they're making.

MR. PERRY: Mr. Walton, could you please pull up the deposition testimony of Mr. Rogers on this topic? It's from his deposition, page 146 to 148.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. I can provide you with the full transcript if you would like.
A. That's fine. I mean, I can't see this; so you will have to --
Q. It's on your screen. Can you see your screen?

Now, I'm going to start -- and I'll try to do it quickly because I don't want to belabor the point. Following along with this transcript from page 146 , line 23 , to 148 , line 6 , are you with me in the transcript?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And in particular, I would start on page 147 THE REPORTING GROUP
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where the question is, could you describe the nature of that input?

It's a reference to input from EPD.
Answer. Yes. Back when we originally met with Linda McGregor, who then worked at EPD, and Gail Cowie about the work we were getting ready to do, you remember me referring to that, they told us very frankly that if changes were going to occur in the Upper Flint or the Lower Flint, that that was going to be a bottom-up political process, meaning that we needed to engage local stakeholders, whether that be upper or Lower Flint, and push for change from the bottom up politically. So we did that and here's the evidence. We're also doing it in the Lower Flint, though not in as formal a way. He didn't stop working from the top down, which means the Governor's office and the legislature, but we took their advice and went to work.

And when we began to produce results, EPD wanted to have a representative at our meeting almost immediately. We asked the group and they did not want EPD in the room. They viewed EPD as the source of the problem.

Now, this goes to be supposing that they all THE REPORTING GROUP
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deeper aquifers for the other purposes there augmenting streamflow.
Q. Now, in your deposition you told me, didn't you, that a number of those technical studies would have been complete by this summer.
A. That was our target date. There were a couple of reasons why we were unable to meet that target date.
Q. Okay. Now, can I invite your attention back to the first page of this same meeting summary.

And there at the bottom of the page there's a reference to Director Turner. Do you see that?
A. A couple -- yes.
Q. It's the last paragraph.
A. Okay.
Q. And then there's a reference to amendments to the Flint River Drought Protection Act. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And do you see it says, he, Director Turner, described the 2014 amendments to the Drought Protection Act as modest steps?
A. I do.
Q. You agree with that; don't you?
A. Yes.

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. So let's turn, if we could, to the 2014 amendments to the Flint River Drought Protection
Act, which you will find at tab 46, which is JX-105, Joint Exhibit 105.

Now, I just want to make clear, this is Senate Bill 213. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's -- these are the amendments to the Flint River Drought Protection Act in 2014. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Can you turn with me, please, in JX-105 to page 3, and in particular section 4 of the Flint River Drought Protection Act. And I'm looking specifically at page 3 , section 4 (a) there. Do you see where it says, on or before March 1 of each year the Division may issue?
A. I do.
Q. And that was a change from will issue?
A. That's correct.
Q. So this has become discretionary in 2014 rather than mandatory. Right?
A. That's correct. That -- that's the learning from the $\mathbf{2 0 1 2}$ drought that this tool was not appropriate under all hydrologic conditions in THE REPORTING GROUP
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the basin.
Q. Now, let me just ask. I have not seen any press release in 2015 or 2016 evaluating whether or not to invoke the Flint River Drought Protection Act. Was any such evaluation done in either of those years?
A. The conditions in the basin were evaluated, yes.
Q. So there was an evaluation as there was in 2011 and 2012 and the like?
A. There was an evaluation of conditions in the basin. I am not aware of whether there was a documented application of the matrix or not in the same manner.
Q. And has the matrix changed since 2011 and 2012?
A. The matrix has not changed, no.
Q. And isn't it true that the state geologist, Jim Kennedy, suggested that the matrix be changed in 2011?
A. Jim Kennedy developed a groundwater-based methodology and suggested that that might be an alternative.
Q. Okay. Now, if you could look with me, please, in section 4(b) on page 3 of Joint Exhibit 105; and it reads, quote, if severe drought conditions are predicted or otherwise declared, the Division may THE REPORTING GROUP
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determine the total number of acres to be subject to an irrigation auction.

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And there again, the word will has been stricken and replaced with may. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Now, I would like to invite your attention to tab 48, please. And there you see an e-mail from Cliff Lewis to you?
A. I do.
Q. And that was attaching Cliff Lewis's notes from the same November 21, 2014, meeting that was the subject matter of JX-154 at tab 45 . Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you asked him for these notes to aid you in preparing your summary of the meeting. Didn't you?
A. That's correct.
Q. And he attended the meeting. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Can you turn -- this is tab 48, FX-69a. And I would like to invite your attention to the bottom of the first page under the heading THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. And does Georgia take the position that groundwater pumping has no impact or no potential impact on streamflow?
A. No. The plan does document and track some of those impacts and then provides for, as I said, permitting restrictions to address those in the basin in the permitting going forward.
Q. Well, that was my next question. In light of what EPD learned through the studies and the technical work, why was the Division comfortable reopening permitting in 2006 if it had been learned that there can be impacts on streamflow from pumping?
A. So one of the results was to identify the range of sensitivity in the watersheds in the basin to those pumping impacts. So depending on where pumping occurs and some of the characteristics in those different watersheds, the effect of that groundwater withdrawal on the stream may be larger or smaller. So the plan categorizes those watersheds into three different categories based on that sensitivity.
Q. Okay. Now, I want to ask you about those three categories; but before I do, I just want to make sure I understand what you just said and see if THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
you can tell me. Are you saying that different pumps in different locations can have different impacts on the streamflow?
A. Yes.
Q. And are some greater and some lesser depending on where that pump happens to be?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, can you describe the zones that were set up as part of this permitting process and explain the significance of those zones for the Court, please.
A. Yes. So the watersheds were put into three categories. One is -- the first and most sensitive category is called the capacity use areas. Those are colored red on the maps in the plan, so they're all called red zones.
Q. Let me pause for one second because I know the Court likes to know where the document addresses that. And so --
A. It helps me, too.
Q. -- I don't want you to read the whole document. We're way past that in this case. But can you just turn to page 23 of tab 17, which is JX-21. MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, that's where you will find the passage she's going THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to describe right now.
A. And the maps I'm referencing actually start on the following page, so that you can see the categorization there.

So that as I said, the --
Q. Wait a minute.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, are you there?
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Okay. Please proceed, Dr. Cowie.
A. The most sensitive of watersheds are identified as capacity use areas. In those areas permitting -- new permits were no longer allowed except for those permits that were already in-house and in the so-called backlog permits or those permits that straddled the boundary into the other less sensitive. So farms that were on the boundary area, there were some allowed there. So that's how the most sensitive watersheds, those red ones, were handled.

The yellow watersheds, the next most sensitive, new permits there required four specific irrigation efficiency technologies be applied to make sure that the water was used efficiently. And then the green watersheds, which were identified as the least sensitive, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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required two of those irrigation efficiency technologies.
Q. Dr. Cowie, with this new regulatory and permitting regime that was adopted in 2006, were you comfortable with the EPD issuing new permits in the basin?
A. The permitting since that time has followed those provisions plus some other ones in the plan that also include limiting permits based on proximity -- restricting permits, actually not allowing permits, based on proximity to streams, springs, and other wells. And so the permitting has been done under those since then.
Q. And, again, just to be clear, the red zone was the most sensitive and the most restrictive; is that right --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in terms of new permits?
A. Yes.
Q. And then yellow and green, progressively less so as the sensitivity declined?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Cowie.

I would now like to ask you about one of the other provisions of the 2006 plan that Mr. Perry THE REPORTING GROUP
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group of $\mathbf{3 0}$ folks. They went through a process of developing recommended plans that specified a divisional goal for the region. They -- EPD provided technical information to them on projected demands in their region, the capacity of that water resources to meet those demands. The council laid out the management practices that fit their vision and goals for their region to meet those projected demands and then also made recommendations to the State for what we needed to do to improve water management and the planning process.
Q. Dr. Cowie, I want to turn now to two concepts. One is the surface water availability analysis in these plans, and then after that we're going to come to groundwater sustainable yield.
A. Yes.
Q. Right now I want to focus on surface water availability. Is that one of the concepts that was looked at as part of the planning process?
A. Yes. That's one of the pieces of technical information that EPD provided to the regional water planning councils as the building blocks for their regional plans.
Q. Can you turn to tab 35 in the binder that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Mr. Perry gave you. We have there FX-24. And can you describe for the Court what FX-24 is and how it fits into the state water planning process.
A. It's the final regional water plan for the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee region. It's one of the 10 regional water plans that was adopted in 2011.
Q. And geographically where is Lower Flint-Ochlockonee?
A. It's in the far southwest corner of the state. So it includes much of the Lower Flint River Basin and a portion of the Chattahoochee River Basin.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Perry focused your attention on a chart in this document; and it's on page 3-6. It's called table 3-1.

MR. PRIMIS: And, your Honor, these are oddly-paged documents. I don't know if you figured out the system yet, but they have sections where they repaginate each one. So we're on 3-6, table 3.1.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. And, Dr. Cowie, what does this table show; and do you recall Mr. Perry asked you about this one specifically?
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A. I do, yes.
Q. Okay. What is shown here?
A. So it shows the results of the modeling exercise that was done to evaluate the ability of the surface water, in this case the rivers, in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee region to meet demands.
Q. Dr. Cowie, we want -- I think Mr. Perry focused you on the row that said Bainbridge. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is that a reference to the Bainbridge Gage?
A. Yes, the U.S. Geologic Survey gage.
Q. Okay. And the particular column he looked at was Maximum Shortfall in cfs. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was $1,376 \mathrm{cfs}$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is -- I find this complicated. And I asked you if you could prepare a demonstrative that might be helpful to guide this discussion. Did you do that?
A. Yes.

MR. PRIMIS: Okay. Can I approach, your Honor?

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You may. THE REPORTING GROUP
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BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Okay. So, Dr. Cowie, using this demonstrative -we'll call it Cowie demonstrative 1 -- can you explain to the Court what that 1,376 maximum shortfall actually resembles or signifies?

It's important because counsel for Florida mentioned it in his opening. He's questioned witnesses about it. We just need to have a clear record of what that number actually is because Florida is asking the Court to make decisions based on that figure.
A. So the place to start is the reason that this analysis was done. It was undertaken to identify areas where the water planning councils should pay attention during the planning process. So we were comparing demand with estimated capacity of the water resource and identifying those where there may be shortfalls based on some indicators chosen to identify potential local or regional impacts. These were modeling exercises. They were not exercises that observed conditions in the river themselves.

Because it was being done for that planning purpose, this -- this assessment in particular used an artificially high demand.
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Q. Let me pause you on that. What do you mean when you say artificially high demand?

And what you're doing now is you're setting up a demand number and then a potential supply number, and that's going to be the maximum shortfall. Correct?
A. Yes. The two are compared.
Q. Okay. So why is it an artificially high demand in this modeling exercise?
A. The way this exercise was constructed is the demand that was used started with the reported demand over a five-year period. Each month the highest demand that was seen for that month during the five years was chosen, so the highest January over the five years, the highest February over the five years, and so on over that -- for 12 months.

So we take a constructed 12 months of demand that is not like any 12 months that has ever occurred, but it's the highest -- each month it's the highest it has ever been observed, and then apply that 12 months over the 68 years of observed streamflow.

So we have an artificially high demand that is applied to the 68 years of observed
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streamflow. And what's recorded here as the
1,376 shortfall occurs on a single day when that artificially high demand gets compared with the 68 years of streamflow.
Q. Now, the last bullet in your slide says it's not a sustainability requirement. What does that mean?
A. Yes. The way a shortfall is estimated is we're trying to look at the ability of the water resources to meet off-stream demand and also in-stream flow. We used a threshold for in-stream flow that was adapted from the state's in-stream flow policy. That in-stream flow policy is specified for individual water withdrawal permit holders. We adapted it for this planning purpose to use it as a threshold to identify a shortfall, to say these are time periods in which we're seeing a shortfall; planning councils, you need to pay attention to as you look at your planning for the future.

So it's not a sustainability requirement. It was a criteria used for this planning exercise.
Q. Dr. Cowie, during opening statements, counsel for Florida said that this $1,376 \mathrm{cfs}$ is the amount of -- the amount flow on the Flint River was
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short under, quote, Georgia's own sustainability requirements. Given your experience in the Division and your knowledge of how this number was constructed, is that true?
A. It's the amount that was short in this modeling exercise. It's not an amount that was in the river. It's not a measurement of a shortfall in the river, and it's not a requirement to be met in the river.
Q. Counsel also said in opening statement that this table -- and we can go back to it in the LFO plan -- suggests that there is, quote, not enough water in the river. Do you agree with that?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. For the reasons I just laid out. It's not an assessment of the water that's in the river. It's a modeling exercise to evaluate under the assumptions that I laid out can off-stream demand be met with this threshold that we used.
Q. Under conditions that don't exist in the real world?
A. That have not been observed in the real world. Correct.
Q. Dr. Cowie, thank you for clarifying that.
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sustainable yield analysis that's also in this Lower Flint Plan. Are you familiar with that?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. And similar arguments have been made about the meaning of those numbers in a very comparable way, and I want to walk through that methodology so the Court has a clear picture what the groundwater sustainable yield is.

For this one, let's turn to page 3-9; and it's table 3-3 of Exhibit FX-24. And do you recognize that chart?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. Can you describe to the chart -- to the Court what this table shows?
A. So it shows the result of the similar assessment that was done for groundwater resources in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee River Basin, the three aquifers that were evaluated as to their capacity to meet demand.
Q. And in particular, focusing on the row called Upper Floridan Aquifer, can you say what's depicted there?
A. Yes. There is estimates of current groundwater withdrawals. And then in the second -- or the THE REPORTING GROUP
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```
drainage areas where the different -- the change
    in groundwater flow to streamflow was evaluated.
    And the colored -- the blue and the green lines
    indicate the streams that are represented on the
    model.
Q. Now, Dr. Cowie, where in this whole map is the section of stream where the sustainable yield trigger was met, thereby setting the sustainable yield number for this whole basin? Where is that?
A. So it shows the -- in the upper central area right there, where it's a pattern of blue and white hatching, is the stream segment. This analysis -- it's the stream segment that triggered that sustainable yield criteria. This analysis was designed, as I said, to identify potential local or regional impacts. So once that sustainable yield threshold was crossed in any single stream segment, that set the sustainable yield for the whole area being evaluated, the whole upper Florida aquifer in the Dougherty Plain.
Q. So this little stretch up here, what is that called?
A. Muckaloochee Creek.
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```

```
Q. And when the sustainable yield was hit for Muckaloochee Creek, using those criteria that Mr. Caldwell mentioned, that set the number for this whole basin?
```

A. When the threshold -- that change in groundwater flow to the stream, when that threshold was hit, that set the lower end of the sustainable yield for that whole aquifer area, yes.
Q. And in the legend, do you see where the little train track type figure is, it says violated river baseflow criteria?
A. Yes.
Q. What does that mean?
A. That's a shorthand statement of that sustainable yield criteria, the one that controlled, that determined the sustainable yield -- lower end sustainable yield measure.
Q. Now, Muckaloochee Creek is pretty far from the state line; isn't it?
A. That's correct.
Q. What effect does the sustainable yield criteria being violated up here in this little stretch north in the basin -- what effect does that have on streamflows down at the state line in the mainstem of the Flint?
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A. It's a small stream -- relatively small stream compared to the river. A change in the baseflow -- baseflow is the groundwater flow that occurs -- that supports that streamflow. So a change in the baseflow is a small change in a small stream. Compared to during -- during dry periods when you're seeing baseflow, the flow you're going to see in that Muckaloochee Creek compared to the flow in the Flint River near the state line would be less than half a percent.
Q. Dr. Cowie, was the sustainable yield criterion, the one that Mr. Caldwell mentioned that was used to conduct this analysis, was it intended to present a limitation on groundwater availability throughout the whole basin?
A. No. It was intended to identify resources to which the water councils should attend in the planning process and identify management practices to support those resources in the future.
Q. And was the analysis that the state water planning council went through, was it intended to reflect flows at the state line based on groundwater pumping in the northern part of the basin?
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A. No. The -- actually, the model is not competent to do that.
Q. And, Dr. Cowie, I wanted to go through this in some detail because it is technical but very important. Did you discuss this in your written direct testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it at pages 15 to 17 of your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Dr. Cowie, you mentioned that these regional water councils made recommendations for actions that could be taken. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have any of those been implemented?
A. Yes.
Q. Let me hand you a document that we marked as GX-1249.

Can you please identify GX-1249?
A. It's a -- slides from a presentation I made at a regional water conference in 2014.
Q. Can you turn to slide 8 of your presentation.

MR. PRIMIS: We're on page 8 , your
Honor.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Dr. Cowie, what is depicted at page 8 of slide 8
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of your October 22nd, 2014, presentation?
A. It's a tally of the implementation activities that were documented in implementation status reports produced in June of 2014.
Q. The first row on this table says, demand management practices.
A. Yes.
Q. And so what does the 25 next to that under Lower Flint-Ochlockonee mean?
A. It's the -- that the reports documented 25 practices that were implemented to decrease demand on water resources in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee region.
Q. Can you provide just one or two examples of that?
A. Sure. For the municipal water users, they replaced waterlines and water meters in order to decrease leaks. For agricultural water users, they -- they documented $\mathbf{\$ 6 . 1}$ million in cost-share funds coming into the region to improve agricultural efficiency and for also adoption of agricultural efficiency performance standards in state law in the 2014 amendments to the Flint River Drought Protection Act.
Q. Dr. Cowie, the next one says water supply practices, and 14 of them for Lower Flint. Can THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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you give just an example or two of what water supply practices were done?
A. Yes. One of the practices that was documented was an evaluation of the feasibility of transferring surface water users -- your surface water irrigators in the Ichawaynochaway Basin from surface water to groundwater. And there was also a demonstration project conducted to assess the feasibility of aquifer storage and recovery in southwest Georgia.
Q. Dr. Cowie, you -- I wanted to ask you just one question I forgot to ask. When we were talking about the average annual discharge provision of the new permits after 2006, do you recall that discussion?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think Mr. Perry asked you how many permits had that, and you said 30.
A. I said less than 30.
Q. Less than 30. And there was a suggestion that that was very few. And I just wanted to ask you why are there fewer than 30 permits with the AAD requirement?
A. Well, surface water is actually not a preferred resource in the basin. So there just haven't THE REPORTING GROUP
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been that many applications that have come through.
Q. So few surface water permits were actually asked for and given?
A. Correct, yes. I mean, that -- that provision was applied to all of the permits that were issued in those areas.
Q. Dr. Cowie, one last topic, and it's an issue that the Special Master has actually asked a number of witnesses about; and he might have been gearing up to ask you.

MR. PRIMIS: So I'm sorry if I steal
your thunder, your Honor.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. But are you familiar with the ACF Stakeholders and their Sustainable Management Plan?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. What is ACFS or ACF Stakeholders?
A. It's a nongovernmental organization with members from the array of water-interest users and interests in the Basin from all three states.
Q. And how did you become familiar with this organization, ACF Stakeholders?
A. They -- the ACF Stakeholders, when they became active, invited observers from all three states.
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When I took on responsibilities for -- related to the ACF Basin, I became Georgia's observer to their meetings. So I got to attend.
Q. And did you stop attending at some point?
A. Yes, I did. When the ACF Stakeholders adopted confidentiality policies, it required membership and signing those confidentiality policies. They don't -- they intentionally do not have governmental -- state governmental members. So I was unable to sign those confidentiality policies, and I stopped attending.
Q. Did you stay abreast of the general goings-on of the stakeholders?
A. Informally, as much as I could. Their confidentiality policies were rather stringent, and they were respected by the folks I spoke with. So it was informal.
Q. Are you familiar with the Sustainable Management Plan that ACFS issued?
A. Yes. I read it when it came out.
Q. And what is the plan?
A. It's the document that they adopted by consensus to, in their view, move the basin -- with recommendations that in their view would move towards more sustainable management that meets THE REPORTING GROUP
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protections; and you referred to 7Q10 and 25 percent AAD. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And those -- those requirements, those low flow protections don't apply to any groundwater permits. Right?
A. No. Because they -- the -- they are based on the flow that's in the stream.
Q. Okay. So let's talk about how many surface water permits there are in total in the entire ACF Basin. Do you know?
A. I don't have that number, no.
Q. It's 1598. And your testimony, I believe, was that there are fewer than 30 that have the 25 percent AAD low flow protection. Is that correct?
A. Those are the permits that are subject -- that were issued since the ' 06 plan was adopted and are subject to that, yes.
Q. Okay. And we have talked a little bit about 7Q10. But let's focus on those that -- those surface water permits that have a 7Q10 low flow protection level. I believe you said you didn't know how many of those there were.
A. That's correct.
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Q. Would you be surprised if it's fewer than 100 ?
A. I actually would be surprised.
Q. And you don't know as you sit here today?
A. I don't know; but I would be surprised, as I said before, because of the number of permits we have and the paper records in which those would be documented. But I don't know.
Q. Grandfathered surface water permits do not have 7Q10 low flow protection; do they?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there are quite a number of those; aren't there?
A. There -- yes. There is a portion of those that would be substantial, yes.
Q. Okay. Now, I believe Mr. Primis asked you about the 2014 amendments; and he referred to an irrigation efficiency number. Is that right? 2014 amendments to the Flint River Drought Protection Act.
A. Yes. There were 2014 amendments.
Q. And there was a number for irrigation efficiency in there. Right?
A. A performance standard for irrigation efficiency was amended into the statute.
Q. That is the statute that you called modest in
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your 2014 stakeholder write-up; isn't it?
A. That -- that is correct. Those changes were considered modest.
Q. Okay. Now, all right. I think you mentioned wastewater discharge just briefly when you were talking to Mr. Primis a moment ago. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, wastewater discharge is something that EPD manages as a matter of implementing the Clean Water Act. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there's a certain amount of water that's necessary to accommodate municipal and industrial permit discharges from upstream permittees. Correct?
A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q. All right. So EPD issues permits for municipal and industrial uses. Right?
A. Wastewater discharges.
Q. And it is governed in that exercise by Clean Water Act requirements. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Including NPDES, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements, right? THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. That's correct.
Q. And in order to ensure that those discharges do not create a Clean Water Act problem, it's necessary to meet a certain flow criteria; is it not?
A. That is not correct, no. The -- there are certain flow levels that are assumed in determining the pollutant loads that are written into the permits.
Q. And if you are below those particular assumed low flow criteria, you could have a significant problem under the Clean Water Act; couldn't you?
A. I think it depends on what's going on and how the permit is written. I think there's a number of specific -- there's not a general answer to that question. It depends on the specifics.
Q. And you know, don't you, that the criteria for Bainbridge -- the annual criteria for Bainbridge under the NPDES permits was 2,500 cfs for wastewater simulation?
A. I'm not aware of what annual criteria you're speaking of.
Q. I'm talking about the annual criteria identified in the 2006 plan. Are you familiar with that?
A. The -- the annual criteria for the wastewater THE REPORTING GROUP
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