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use in comparison to that flow. And if you look at that, you can just see how small the consumptive use is in comparison to the flows that enter the State of Florida.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Mayer. And your only analysis is to look at the size of consumptive use versus the size of the flows. Correct?
A. No. I also looked at the size of the population. I mean, you have to understand that this small amount of flow that's being represented here and the consumptive use supports 5.1 million people in Georgia and an economy of billions and billions of dollars of great significance to the State of Georgia and to the nation. To me, that's an important aspect of whether their water use is reasonable.
Q. Mr. Mayer, I'm just asking you a yes or no question. You have compared a big number and a small number. Right?

That's what you have done in paragraph 42 and the figure that follows. Right?
A. I have compared the flow into -- at the state line into Florida with the municipal and industrial consumptive use in Georgia.
Q. That's --
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A. Now, you -- those are your words, big and small.
Q. Correct. You did not analyze the impact of flows and Georgia's M \& I water use on ecosystems of the ACF basis or on downstream water users. Right?
A. No. That's not something I looked at.
Q. Mr. Mayer, you also testified that you believe Georgia's future M \& I consumptive uses will be reasonable. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Your prefiled testimony indicates you believe that the future M \& I water assumption will be small. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's based on the Metro District's 2050 projections. Correct?
A. Yes. That's based on the water supply request -the most recent water supply request, which has actually gone down considerably from the previous water supply request.
Q. And you were familiar with that water supply request when you wrote your expert report. Right?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. You were familiar with the projections contained
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in that request. Right?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. But you didn't factor any future projections into the work you did when you prepared your expert report. Right?
A. No. That's not something that they asked me to do at that point in time.
Q. And so you had not done any analysis to compare metro Atlanta's return flow percentages and future return flow projections. Right?
A. I did not look at future return flow projections.
Q. And, again, there's, in your assessment of future growth, still no analysis of impacts on downstream users. Correct?
A. Again, that was something that other experts were tasked with.
Q. You have concluded that the water use was reasonable. Right?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And you defined reasonable to include impacts on downstream users and ecosystems. Right?
A. Including that, but also including the population supported and the economy supported by that water use. Those are also very important aspects of reasonable water use. THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
Q. Mr. Mayer, will you turn to tab 2 in your binder.

You gave a deposition in this case. Correct?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you swore to tell the truth?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And there was a court reporter who took down your testimony. Correct?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. Will you turn to page 60. Specifically look at line 23. You were asked a simple question, what is your definition of reasonable?

You answered, I would think that reasonable in the water use context means that you're using water in a way that is conscious of the ecosystem and of other water users who also rely on the same water.

Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer?
A. Yes, I did. But I would also note that in the previous pages we had a discussion about Dr. Flewelling's report where we talked about the level of consumption, and it was important to understand the population supported by that consumption as part of reasonable. And also later on we discussed other aspects besides just THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the ecosystem.
Q. You have also offered an opinion on the effectiveness of Georgia's conservation and efficiency policies, the ones you reviewed. Correct?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. You listed several such conservation policies and plans and measures. Right?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Policies that Georgia has undertaken since 2003?
A. Some of them have been taken since 2003, yes.

Some of them may have started earlier.
Q. You included the Metro District plan for 2003, the updated plan 2009, Water Stewardship Act just as examples. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Mayer, you did not do anything to analyze what water savings are attributable to any particular conservation policy, plan, or measure that Georgia put in place over that period of time. Right?
A. No. I chose to look at the totality of consumptive use and per capita use that represent the impact of all of the measures together. I didn't look at any individual measure.
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Q. Mr. Mayer, I'm going to ask you narrow questions; and I would appreciate, if you can, answering yes or no. Your counsel will have an opportunity to ask you about them if there's anything that's unclear or anything you need to explain. Is that okay?
A. That's perfectly fine.
Q. You also did not make any effort to quantify the results of your conservation policies, plans, and measures in terms of specific impacts on withdrawals, return rates, or consumptive use. Right?
A. I would disagree. I think by looking at the significant reduction in per capita use and by looking at the consumptive use over the last 20 years, which has essentially stayed stable and actually declined slightly, I think I have looked at that.
Q. Mr. Mayer, I'm just going to ask one more time. You did not make any effort to quantify the results of those conservation measures in terms of affecting withdrawals, returns, or consumptive use. Correct?
A. I did not look at the impact of any individual conservation measure. I think my analysis looked THE REPORTING GROUP
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at the impact of the totality of all of the measures and policies that Georgia has put into place.
Q. Mr. Mayer, just a yes or no. I take it that's a, no, you didn't look at the results and quantify the results of those measures in terms of affecting withdrawals, returns, or consumptive use?
A. Again, I disagree. I think I did look at the impact of those -- the totality of those measures. I did not -- I would agree I didn't look at the impact of any individual measure; but I think my analysis takes into consideration the totality of those measures.
Q. Mr. Mayer, will you turn back to tab 2, to your deposition. Again, you swore to testify truthfully. Correct?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. If you will turn to page 185 now. You were asked, did you make any effort to quantify the results of those measures in terms of affecting withdrawals or returns or consumptive use?

And you answered, that's not something that I was asked to look at.
A. And, again, $\mathbf{I}$--
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Q. Were you asked that question, and did you give that answer?
A. I did give that answer.
Q. Okay.
A. But what I'm hearing in your question is a reference to specific individual measures.
Q. Mr. Mayer, I asked you the exact same question.

I would like to talk to you now about specific conservation methods that you note in your direct testimony. Okay?

You're familiar with leak abatement. Correct?
A. Yes. I'm familiar with leak abatement. It's also called water loss control.
Q. Water loss. And in the 2010 Water Stewardship Act there is references to water loss. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. There is a water loss audit required. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you discuss in your prefiled direct testimony some of the steps that Georgia has taken to try to address water loss through audits and leak abatement. Correct?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You were here when Ms. Kirkpatrick testified

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart


| 3512 | 3514 |
| :---: | :---: |
| the Metro Water District or across the entire state. <br> Q. And you weren't familiar with the Flint River Drought Protection Act. Correct? <br> A. No. <br> Q. Mr. Mayer, will you turn to page 20 in tab 1 -this is, again, your prefiled direct testimony -and specifically figure 9. It's a timeline that I believe you put together of Georgia's urban water management and drought. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Do you see it? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Just to get your understanding of what's depicted, is it your opinion that a drought occurs only if one is declared and actions are taken to reduce demand? <br> A. No. A drought could occur if it's not declared; but I -- in this figure, I specifically listed the declared droughts. <br> Q. And your view is that whether or not a drought occurred is not dependent on whether it's declared. Right? <br> A. A drought could occur without it being declared. <br> Q. The timeline depicts a series of Acts, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | a drought from approximately 1999 to 2001? <br> A. I was here. I don't specifically recall that, but I'll accept that. <br> Q. You have got it listed as a five-year drought. Correct? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. You also show a drought from 2006 to 2009? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Do you see that? <br> A. Yes, I do. <br> Q. You're aware that Georgia did not ban outdoor water use until September 2007 during that drought. Right? <br> A. Yes. They implemented a full ban on outdoor water use at that point, which continued all the way through 2008. <br> Q. And that was after the 2006 portion of the drought you have on here. Right? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. And -- <br> A. That's correct. <br> Q. -- that was after the summer of 2007. Right? <br> A. Yes. But that's also typical of drought response. It's a ramping-up process. <br> Q. Is it typical of drought response to declare a THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
| regulations, and droughts for Georgia. Right? <br> A. It does. <br> Q. You don't have any conservation measures from 1992 to 2001. Right? <br> A. I beg your pardon? <br> Q. Well, there is no conservation measures identified between 1992 and the creation of the Metro District in 1991 -- or 2002? <br> A. No, there's not any measures listed here; but I believe there's a number of measures in place and there were active water conservation programs at the utility level going on during that time. <br> Q. You just didn't include them on the timeline? <br> A. Well, the time -- this is a timeline of management and drought, not of individual utility water conservation measures. <br> Q. That's not part of the management that you evaluated? <br> A. It certainly is part of the management $I$ evaluated, but that's not what is shown in this figure. <br> Q. You show a drought from 1998 to 2003 . Do you see that? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Are you aware former Director Turner testified to THE REPORTING GROUP | drought after the summer peak usage months? <br> A. You know, I wasn't involved in specifically declaring that drought or what was -- what goes on. Every drought is a little different; and, you know, there are a number of factors that go into a drought declaration. <br> Q. You have got no drought on here after 2009. Right? <br> A. Correct. Because there was not a declared drought after that. <br> Q. There was no drought in 2011? <br> A. Well, there was a dry period certainly in the southwest portion of the state; but it was not a declared drought, particularly in the Metro Water District. <br> Q. And there was -- there's no drought listed in 2012 either. Correct? <br> A. No. <br> Q. Again, you said you were here for Director Turner's testimony. Right? <br> A. Yes, I was. <br> Q. He testified that there was no question by 2012 we were in the middle of a severe drought. Do you remember that? <br> A. You know, I might not have been here for his THE REPORTING GROUP |



now. There's a drought currently in northern Georgia. Correct?
A. Correct. It is my understanding that they just very recently increased it to a level 2 drought response.
Q. And you're aware there is actually a drought declared throughout much of the state. Right?
A. Yes. Yes. I believe level 1 was declared in September; and then level 2 -- it was escalated to level 2 just a few days ago.
Q. Are you aware Governor Deal indicated just last week that drought conditions have been in place for more than six months?
A. I'm not aware of any specific quotation from Governor Deal.
Q. Can you turn to tab 7 in your binder. This is FX-896. And you see this as an Executive Order from Governor Deal. Correct?
A. Correct. Dated the 14th of November.
Q. That's just last week. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. The first sentence indicates that over the preceding six months Georgia has experienced significant drought conditions. Right?
A. Yes, I see that.
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Q. And are you aware that at this point in time, November 14, drought level 2 had been declared?
A. Yes. I'm aware that drought level 2 has been declared.
Q. It was declared after this though; wasn't it?
A. After the 14th -- I'm not exactly sure what day the official declaration was made.
Q. But you know that level 2 was declared just last week?
A. Yes. Very recently.
Q. And until then there were no statewide outdoor watering restrictions in response to the current drought. Correct?
A. Correct. But, again, I think it's important to remember that there are many different factors that go into the declaration of the drought. And -- I'Il leave it at that.
Q. Earlier I asked you about whether restrictions needed to be in place after peak usage months or restrictions needed to be in place during the summer months. Do you recall that?
A. I do recall that.
Q. Drought level 2 doesn't limit the watering of athletic fields or golf courses. Correct?
A. No. But it does limit the watering on all other THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
types of properties, which is a much larger area.
Q. By all other types of properties you don't mean commercial agricultural properties?
A. No. I'm talking about urban, municipal, single-family homes, multifamily homes.
Q. And those people are allowed to water two days a week. Correct?
A. Under level 2 they are restricted to two days a week and a specific two days a week on an odd/even schedule.
Q. And they're not restricted in the amount that they can water. Right?
A. Well, they're restricted to the time of day that they're allowed to water and then on the days that they're allowed to water.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Mayer; but they're not restricted on the amount they can water. Right?
A. No. There is not a volumetric limitation.
Q. And the level 2 declaration that was last week, it's now November. Right?
A. It is now November, yes.
Q. And you agree that's after the peak water use months. Correct?
A. Yes. It's after the peak water use months.
Q. You don't know how much more effective the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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declaration would have been if it was declared earlier in the year; do you?
A. Again, I wasn't involved in the decisions that went into declaring this drought. I -- so I can't speculate about that.
Q. And you can't speculate about how much more effective it would be to have an outdoor watering ban than a two-day-a-week limitation?
A. Certainly banning outdoor water use will -- is more effective than a two-day watering ban. But I -- it's -- I was not involved in the decision to make any of these particular levels enacted.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Mayer.

MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, one moment.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sure.
MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, we have some
demonstratives we would like to use for
Mr. Mayer's redirect, if I might hand them out.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Please. REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ALLEN:
Q. Mr. Mayer, will you please tell the Court a little bit about your background and what it is you do.
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prefiled direct. Are you familiar with this
table, sir?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And we have highlighted the first three conservation measures that Dr. Sunding has identified here that pertain to municipal and industrial water use. Now, I want to ask you about a few of those since it's your area of expertise.

Let's start with the bottom one, eliminate net basin exports. To what does that refer to your understanding?
A. So that would refer to eliminating the water that is being withdrawn from one basin, delivered to customers who happen to live in another basin. And then because of the gravity nature of sewer systems, that water is then discharged through a wastewater plant that is located in another basin.
Q. All right. And Ms. Kirkpatrick testified a little bit about why those happened, so I won't repeat that testimony here. But I will ask you to see if you look in the eliminate net basin exports column, and you go across, and there is a column -- excuse me, a row for eliminate net THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
basin exports. The column on the far right includes incremental fiscal cost per year. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And Dr. Sunding has failed to assign a cost to eliminating net basin exports. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you believe that eliminating IBT's or net basin exports would be costless?
A. I view this as somewhat magical thinking on behalf of Dr. Sunding. I took a look at what it might take to eliminate net basin exports, and my very rough engineering estimate is that we're looking at costs in the hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars.
Q. Can you just explain how the cost could be so significant?
A. Well, to eliminate a net basin export as they occur in the ACF would require on the one -- one way you could do it, I suppose, would be to capture the discharge from the wastewater treatment plants, a number of them in the basin, and then to construct a brand new pipeline that would then -- and then to pump that water through that new pipeline back to the basin of origin. THE REPORTING GROUP
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That's extremely expensive.
Q. All right. I want to move on and talk about a separate of Dr. Sunding's conservation measures.
The first one you have highlighted is municipal leak abatement. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have an understanding as to where

Dr. Sunding got his -- what his source was for this municipal leak abatement proposal?
A. Yes. This comes from, I believe, the 2009 task force report.
Q. Okay. Mr. Mayer, I want to show you a portion of that task force report and then ask you some questions about it.
A. Sure.
Q. I'm showing you JX-40. It is appendix III to the water contingency planning task force report. Sir, if you will turn with me to page 61.
A. Yes. I'm there.
Q. All right. So first of all, Dr. Sunding assigns a savings of 42 cfs for municipal leak abatement. I believe you testified that came from a task force report. Do you think it's appropriate for Dr. Sunding to rely on the savings from a task force report in his expert report? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. No. The task force report came out in 2009. So it's quite out of date, particularly as related to leak abatement and water loss because it predates all of the Water Stewardship Act and the best management practices that Georgia has implemented over the last few years.
Q. Now, Mr. Mayer, in this table 4 that we were looking at in tab 8 of your binder, Dr. Sunding does not assign a cost to municipal leak abatement. However, elsewhere in his expert report he does state, I believe, that municipal leak abatement costs would be around 16 or 17 million. Do you agree with that cost assessment?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, if you look here, Dr. Sunding cited what I believe just to be the 17 million in capital costs, which I'm not sure what column number that is; but you can see it's there at 17. But just one column over you can see the total cost of this leak abatement proposal is $\mathbf{\$ 2 6 2}$ million.
And then that doesn't even really include the big ticket item, which would be the replacement of pipelines and infrastructure. That is cited at 1.2 to $\$ 2.4$ billion.
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mgd, based on Dr. Sunding's analysis, at over \$23 million per mgd.

Similarly, if you look at the task force report, leak abatement, they propose $\mathbf{\$ 2 6 2}$ million in total costs. That works out to over \$10 million per mgd.

So both of those greatly exceed this \$3.5 million number.
Q. All right. Mr. Mayer, let's shift to -- stick with Dr. Sunding, but shift to a different topic.

Mr. Mayer, were you here when Dr. Sunding was directly asked, would your proposed M \& I remedy exceed total M \& I consumption? Were you here for that?
A. I was.
Q. And you heard Dr. Sunding say that in his view, his remedies would not exceed total municipal and industrial consumption. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, I heard him say that in response to a question from the Special Master.
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. No. I do not.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, I prepared a demonstrative to specifically address this point.
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Q. And is this demonstrative 9 ?
A. Let's see.
Q. Or tab 9?
A. This is demonstrative 9; correct.
Q. Okay. So if we all look at tab 9, can you tell us what you're showing here?
A. So this is -- I have put two graphs here on tab 9. Let's start on the graph on the left. The graph on the left shows the 2011 municipal and industrial consumptive use in the Georgia ACF on a monthly basis. And 2011 is specifically the year that Dr. Sunding suggests that his conservation scenarios should be applied against.

Then on the right I have applied
Dr. Sunding's conservation scenarios as he specified in his testimony to Georgia's 2011 municipal and industrial consumptive use.
Q. And, Mr. Mayer, what conclusions do you draw, if any, from this comparison?
A. Well, as you can see in three months of the year, in February, March, and April, Dr. Sunding's proposal exceeds the available consumptive use in Georgia. And in other months of the year, his proposal reduces dramatically. And I would even say almost at a draconian level the consumptive THE REPORTING GROUP
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use in the Georgia ACF.
Q. And, Mr. Mayer, do you -- were you also here when Dr. Sunding said that he didn't believe his reductions would exceed consumptive use because certain M \& I groundwater withdrawals were not included?
A. Yes, I was here.
Q. And do you agree with that statement from Dr. Sunding?
A. No. Dr. Sunding suggested groundwater withdrawals were about 15 percent, I believe. First of all, I don't -- I think that in itself is an overstatement. But let's just take him at his word. If we were to increase consumptive use by 15 percent, what you would see would be that the consumptive -- his proposal would still exceed the available consumptive use in two months of the year.
Q. All right. Mr. Mayer, I want to move on to another topic you were asked about in your cross-examination; and that was the comparison you did between flows in the Apalachicola River and municipal and industrial water use.

Can you turn to tab 10, sir.
A. Sure.
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Q. Just so we're all clear, you have in fact done an analysis to compare Georgia's municipal and industrial consumptive use to flows at the state line. Correct?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And if we're all looking at tab 10, can you tell us what you're trying to show here?
A. Sure. Tab 10 has two lines again. The blue line is the flow in the Apalachicola River at the Chattahoochee Gage just below the Woodruff Dam at the Georgia and Florida state line. So that's really the water that's flowing into Florida. The purple line at the bottom is the Georgia municipal and industrial consumptive use.
Q. And what, if anything, does this tell you, sir?
A. Well, this tells me that the municipal and industrial consumptive use in Georgia is a tiny fraction of the water that is being delivered at the state line to Florida. Yet, this is the water that supports 5.1 million people and the multi-billion dollar economy.
Q. And, Mr. Mayer, we have talked about some of the concerns you have with Dr. Sunding's proposal surrounding municipal and industrial water use. But have you, in fact, looked at what impact THE REPORTING GROUP
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the State of Georgia going back to roughly 2008?
A. Yes, ma'am; that's correct. The Water Policy

Center served as a subcontractor to Black \&
Veatch who was engaged by the State of Georgia as the prime contractor to develop the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee, Upper Flint, and Middle Chattahoochee Regional Water Plans.
Q. And, sir, the technical oversight committee of the ACFS Group was primarily responsible for working with these contractors. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And if we --
A. That's correct.
Q. If we look -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to talk over you.

If we look back on the first page that's up on this screen, we'll see the technical committee. It's right there in the middle. It says TOCWG.

Sir, this is the technical oversight committee. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am. That's correct.
Q. And it comprised stakeholders representing these four groups that we see here, Apalachicola, Flint, Middle Chattahoochee, and Upper THE REPORTING GROUP
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Chattahoochee?
A. That's correct. The stakeholders early on broke the entire ACF Basin into four sub-basins for their purposes of the Apalachicola, the Flint, the Upper Chattahoochee from the headwaters of the Chattahoochee down to roughly West Point Lake, and then the Lower and Middle Chattahoochee from West Point Lake down to Lake Seminole.
Q. And three of these four stakeholder groups represent stakeholder interests in Georgia. Correct?
A. Georgia as well as Alabama; that's correct.
Q. Okay. And the Apalachicola is the Florida stakeholders; correct?
A. Generally speaking, $I$ would say that's correct. The Apalachicola Basin itself is fully contained within the State of Florida. So those representatives were necessarily Florida residents.
Q. Okay. And if we just look above this, we'll see there is a listing for executive -- the executive committee members as well. Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. And that's the same breakdown in terms of the stakeholder groups. Correct?
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A. Yes, ma'am; it is. It's broken down by sub-basin the way the stakeholders defined them. And there are two representatives that are elected from each of those sub-basin caucuses to represent their group on the executive committee.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. WINE: Now, if we go back to the second page again, Mr. Walton.

And I don't think you have the very bottom of that page up on your screen, Mr. Walton.

Can we get the stuff that appears under -- no, no. It's not on that page.

That's not -- it's not there.
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Sir, in the copy in your binder do you see that there's some additional contractors listed under -- at the bottom of that page?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do see that.
Q. And one of them is the Georgia Water Resources Institute or GWRI; is that right?
A. I do see that, yeah.
Q. And they're affiliated with Georgia Tech, which is a public university of Georgia?
A. That's correct.
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Q. Is that -- and you understand that GWRI served as a subcontractor to Black \& Veatch for this work?
A. That is $\mathbf{m y}$ understanding.
Q. And you also understand that GWRI more generally serves as the State of Georgia's National Water Research Institute. Correct?
A. I believe that GWRI at Georgia Tech is the state's Water Resource Institute, which I believe is somehow connected to the U.S. Geological Survey and some other federal entities perhaps. But that is my understanding, yes.
Q. And GWRI is run by a fellow named Dr. Aris Georgakakos. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, one of Georgia Tech's responsibilities in the ACF -- ACFS process was to review the Army Corps of Engineers' UIF's. Correct?
A. As I recall, the stakeholders engaged

Dr. Georgakakos and his team to perform a review of what became known as the UIF, or the unimpaired flows dataset, yes.
Q. All right. And Georgia Tech prepared a report called the Unimpaired Flow Assessment Report in late 2012. Correct?
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sentences to yourself, sir.
A. I have read the first two sentences.
Q. And, sir, do you see that there is an estimate there that about half of the total -- sorry -that these impoundments are estimated to be about half of the total surface area of the main river stem reservoirs, including all federal and Georgia power projects?
A. I see that sentence.
Q. And, sir, is that consistent with your understanding of the extent of farm ponds and other impoundments in the Georgia portion of the ACF Basin?
A. I don't have any knowledge as to the extent of surface area of farm ponds or other reservoirs in the ACF Basin. That's -- that's not an area of which I have done any work.
Q. Sir, in the mapping work that you have done of the ACF Basin, which we'll get into a little bit later, did that at all map or estimate the size of farm ponds and other impoundments on farms in the ACF Basin?
A. As part of our detailed and field verification mapping work, we would capture withdrawals that may be from farm ponds. But our field THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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verification work as part of the mapping that we completed did not account for surface area or anything of that kind.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And, sir, if you could just look at the bottom of the paragraph that you were just reading. Do you see that Georgia Tech, at least in this report, estimates that the net evaporation from these impoundments could be up to 1200 cfs net loss?
A. So I'm reading the last full sentence in that -that's on my screen. I see that number, yes.
Q. Okay. And, sir, do you recall having discussions with anybody in the State of Georgia about the potential for an additional 1200 cfs in consumptive use based on these impoundments?
A. No, ma'am.
Q. Sir, we talked earlier about Mr. Woody Hicks. Again, you're familiar with him?
He's at the Jones Center in Atlanta -- or Georgia; I'm sorry?
A. I believe -- I am familiar with Mr. Hicks. I believe he is retired now from the Jones Ecological Research Center which is in Newton, Georgia.
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Q. And, sir, if you could turn to tab 4 of your binder. Sir, you will see there there is an e-mail from Mr. Hicks that cc's you dated March 29, 2013? Do you see that, sir?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. And, sir, could you just take a moment just to read this e-mail to yourself.
A. I have read the e-mail.
Q. And, sir, do you recall receiving this e-mail?
A. I do now.
Q. And do you recall that Mr. Hicks was referencing the criticisms of the UIF dataset as reflected in the work that Georgia Tech did?
A. I'm not sure that Mr. Hicks was referring specifically to the UIF report. He may very well be.

And I may need to read it again. I don't recall seeing that in the e-mail.
Q. Do you read this as he is expressing concerns about the UIF dataset that's being used by the Corps?
A. I see Mr. Hicks mentioning his concern. And I believe this to be Mr. Hicks's individual personal concerns about modeling linkages and perhaps information on demand.
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I'm still not seeing reference to the UIF report or the UIF's in general.
Q. Okay. When he talked about the linkages, he does mention EPD efforts. Correct?
A. Yes. He mentions in the parens there USGS and EPD efforts.
Q. Okay. As we said before, the Corps gets its consumptive use numbers from the EPD. Correct?
A. I believe EPD provides use estimates, demand estimates to the Corps, yes.
Q. Okay. And just stepping back from this e-mail, since it's not clear what it's referencing, do you recall discussions with Mr. Hicks more generally about the UIF dataset?
A. I don't specifically remember discussing the UIF dataset with Mr. Hicks. I was involved, as you have pointed out, in the stakeholders process; and I know the stakeholders discussed the UIF's. So it's certainly reasonable to think that Mr. Hicks had discussed it as part of his work with the stakeholders. But I don't specifically remember discussing it individually with Mr. Hicks.
Q. Okay. Now, Georgia Tech concluded in the UIF report that the UIF's needed to be improved THE REPORTING GROUP
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would take about six months to complete the work
    necessary to update and fix the errors in the
    UIF's?
    A. I don't specifically remember that, no.
    Q. Okay. Sir, if you could just continue reading on
        the rest of that paragraph on page 15 of the
        Sustainable Water Management Plan, FX-883. And I
        want to direct your attention to a sentence in
        the middle of the paragraph.
        Actually, it's a continuation of what we were
        just looking at. So after saying that about the
        time and monetary commitment, do you see the line
        that says, ACFS decided to proceed with the
        modeling runs using existing UIF's in any event?
    A. I do see that, yes.
    Q. Do you see that they say that they're going to
        use the UIF's and the modeling of the UIF's for
        trends and relative comparison rather than for absolute numbers?
A. I do see that, yes.
Q. And, sir, do you recall having a discussion with anybody about what that -- what that sentence means, using these for trends and relative comparisons rather than for absolute numbers?
THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. I believe that's a reference to the stakeholders' general, I guess programmatic, if you will, way in which they were developing their plan.

In other words, the stakeholders were looking at different suites of water management packages to see how those different management practices would impact their suite of performance metrics; that is, are those performance metrics getter better or getting worse? That is looking at trends of different water management practices.
Q. Okay. And if I am to understand you correctly, is the idea that if you're just comparing different alternatives and looking at trends, to the extent there's error and uncertainty in what you're looking at, it's going to be constant in comparing those different alternatives?
A. I don't know depending -- I think that would be, you know, item specific. I'm not sure that we could make that statement on every single scenario that the stakeholders investigated.

I think this sentence, again, is a throw-back to, you know, we want to see how a suite of management practices either improves or harms our
suite of performance metrics and identify those THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
trends rather than focusing on individual numbers.
Q. Okay. So there was still a concern about using the UIF dataset if you were trying to look at an absolute number or a particular flow number?
A. I think there were some concerns expressed by certain stakeholders that the UIF's may not allow for that precise a comparison.

What I would just remind you of is that the consensus of the stakeholders was, in fact, to utilize the existing Corps of Engineers UIF dataset in order to -- and I recall this being discussed a lot in the technical committee -being able to speak the same language as the Corps of Engineers.
Q. And do you recall, in addition to some of the stakeholders being concerned about the UIF -- the use of the UIF's, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also expressed serious concerns with the use of the UIF's. Correct?
A. You mentioned in an earlier question concern expressed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I seem to recall them reviewing this. I don't remember the details of their review.
Q. Sir, if you could please turn to tab 5 in your THE REPORTING GROUP
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stakeholders' metrics were set by the unimpaired flows dataset.
Q. Okay. Now, some of the members of the ACFS Group did not like the UIF assessment report. Correct?
A. I recall concerns expressed from a number of stakeholders concerning the -- what we're calling the UIF report.
Q. And are you familiar with the Atlanta Regional Commission?
A. Generally speaking I know what the Atlanta Regional Commission is, yes.
Q. They are known as the ARC for short?
A. Yes.
Q. And they were one of the members of the ACF Stakeholders Group?
A. ARC was a member -- is a member of the Stakeholders Group, yes.
Q. And ARC represents the interests of metro Atlanta and surrounding counties. Correct?
A. Generally speaking, yes.
Q. And do you recall that Katherine Zitsch was one of the ARC representatives who participated in the ACF Stakeholders Group?
A. I recall Katherine Zitsch representing ARC on the governing board of ACF Stakeholders, yes. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Q. Okay. If you could please, sir, turn to tab 7 in your binder. Sir, this is a September 5, 2014, memo from Katherine Zitsch to you. Do you see that, sir?
A. I see that it was -- the memo was sent to me as well as Gail Bingham, the ACFS facilitator.
Q. That's correct. And do you recall receiving this memo?
A. I do.
Q. And do you recall that in this memo the ARC was objecting to the citation or dissemination of Georgia Tech's UIF assessment report?
A. I don't remember all of the contents of the memo.
Q. But you remember in general they were lodging an objection to the dissemination of this report?
A. I recall ARC expressing concerns about some of the aspects of the UIF report, yes.
Q. And they didn't want it cited or disseminated by the ACFS Stakeholders Group. Correct?
A. As I recall, the UIF report, as well as other technical materials that were being developed as part of the ACF Stakeholders process, were in fact considered what stakeholders ended up calling restrictive materials that were not to be disseminated out of the ACF Stakeholders process. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

I recall that the UIF report was, in fact, one of those documents, yes.
Q. Right. And under the policy for restricted materials, the only way a technical report could be disseminated outside of the ACFS Stakeholder Group is if all the members agreed that it could be shared more broadly. Correct?
A. Correct. The restricted materials policy stated that if the stakeholders agreed by consensus to a public release of a document, then that document could in fact be released.
Q. And if one stakeholder objected to the release of that document, that could be sufficient to prevent the dissemination of that technical report. Correct?
A. It could. The stakeholders operated in terms of restricted materials as well as the substantive issues of their plan by consensus. So one stakeholder in that sense could prevent a recommendation from going into the SWMP or a document being released, yes.
Q. And, sir, the ARC put in this objection to the dissemination of the UIF report about two years after it was published -- published. Correct?
A. The memo is dated September 2014. I believe the THE REPORTING GROUP
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UIF report was dated November -- October, November, of 2012, I believe, yes.
Q. That's correct. So about two years later?
A. Give or take.
Q. And, sir, you recall that Dr. Georgakakos of Georgia Tech was not happy about ARC's belated criticisms of the UIF assessment report. Correct?
A. I'm not sure to the degree that Dr. Georgakakos was happy or unhappy. I recall Dr. Georgakakos drafting a memo to certain members of the ACF Stakeholders regarding certain criticisms of the UIF report.
Q. Yes. And, sir, if you could turn to tab 8 in your binder. Sir, this is an e-mail from Dr. Georgakakos dated September 17, 2014. The Re: line is ARC comments on UIF report. And it appears in the original version to have attached a memo.

And I believe we have redacted the e-mail addresses so that personal e-mails were not shown in this proceeding. But if you will look at the Dear line at the top of that e-mail, one of the people is Mark. And I believe that's you, sir, having seen the e-mail address.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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consumptive use data that feeds into that UIF dataset?
A. And, again, I'm not sure to the degree that the State of Georgia through efforts that I'm not aware of could be investigating that. I'm not aware of any formal updates from the State of Georgia to the unimpaired flows dataset.
Q. Okay, sir. Just one more topic regarding the Sustainable Water Management Plan. As you said, the goal was for the ACFS Group to reach consensus agreement. Correct?
A. The ultimate goal of the ACF Stakeholders was to reach a consensus agreement on a plan for sustainably managing the waters of the ACF Basin, yes.
Q. And part of the consensus that this group reached was to explicitly recommend that Florida receive additional water into the Apalachicola River. Correct?
A. So I think it's important to understand, and as I mentioned briefly before, the stakeholders recommended a suite of water management practices, specifically not a menu of options by which to pick and choose.

If you look at the recommendations that were THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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approved by consensus of the ACF Stakeholders, you will find that the majority and a lot of recommendations involve operations of the Corps of Engineers. As part of that package -- and not to get too much into the detail -- essentially what the stakeholders were suggesting is that more water be stored in times when the water is available in the basin in the Corps reservoirs, and changing the way the Corps of Engineers manages that water and makes releases.

One of the recommendations that is in the Sustainable Water Management Plan is to use all of that additional water that is stored by changing operations to allow for two pulse flows into the Apalachicola River during two periods of the year.
Q. So, sir, the answer to my question was, yes, that the consensus of this group was to explicitly recommend that Florida receive additional water into the Apalachicola River?
A. Understanding that that is one of a suite of packages that is contingent on the entire suite being adopted.
Q. Thank you.

Now, I want to switch topics, sir, and talk
THE REPORTING GROUP
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about some of the agriculture methods and conservation measures that you talk about in your prefiled direct.

First, sir, you're familiar with center-pivot irrigation. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am; I am.
Q. And center-pivots frequently have end-guns on them that extend the range of an irrigation system approximately 100 feet?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And in your prefiled direct on pages 28 through 30 -- you know, you have it in front of you -- we included a couple of pictures of end-guns on center-pivots spraying water on roads in Florida. Correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. Now, you have seen this phenomenon in Georgia, too; haven't you?
A. I have.
Q. And if you turn to tab 10 in your binder, just take a look at the picture that's included there. That appears to be a center-pivot irrigation system spraying water on the road. Correct?
A. It does.
Q. Okay. And, sir, you know that you testified in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart 3615 your prefiled direct that you don't believe pictures like that, even if taken in Georgia, show that Georgia farmers are inefficiently or inappropriately using water on a large-scale basis. Correct?
A. It's my testimony that a picture or a handful of pictures of water going onto noncropped areas is not indicative of the overall management of water by Georgia farmers; that's correct.
Q. And you don't think that we can draw broader conclusions about the practices of farmers in the ACF Basin as a whole based on a picture like that. Correct?
A. I think drawing broad conclusions from individual pictures about any practice, and in this case farmers in the entirety of ACF Georgia, would not necessarily be appropriate.
Q. And, sir, you're aware, aren't you, that this
practice of watering roads through irrigation systems occurs so frequently in south Georgia that there's been a nickname developed for it?
A. I'm dying to hear what that is.
Q. Have you heard of the nickname "going through a south Georgia car wash"?
A. I have heard that on occasion, yes.
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Q. Okay. And do you know who Mr. Calvin Perry is?
A. I do.
Q. He's a well-respected agricultural researcher at University of Georgia?

\section*{A. Calvin Perry is the superintendent at the Stripling Irrigation Farm, I believe.}
Q. Okay. Well-respected guy?
A. I have known Calvin a long time. I think he's a good guy, yes.
Q. Have you ever heard him say that this phenomenon happens often and used the term "south Georgia car wash"?
A. I don't specifically remember Mr. Perry saying that, but it's possible.
Q. Okay. Now, the practice of watering roads is so prevalent in Georgia that it's gone to the trouble of making special road signs to warn drivers of slippery roads due to irrigation hazard?

If you want to see what I'm talking about, sir, you can flip to tab 13 in your book.
A. I see the picture.
Q. Do you recall ever seeing signs like this in south Georgia?
A. I do not.
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Q. Okay. I can represent that this is a picture taken in south Georgia; and it's a sign that was still up this summer and has been up for a number of years, sir.

Sir, are you familiar with the fact that the practice of watering roads in Georgia is so prevalent that a number of counties in Georgia have had to enact ordinances to try to curb the practice?
A. I'm not aware of that, no.
Q. You're not aware of any of these ordinances?
A. I have heard of certain ordinances. I'm not aware of specific counties necessarily that have adopted such ordinances.
Q. But you have heard that some of these ordinances might exist?
A. I have.
Q. Okay. Sir, if you could turn, please, to tab 15 in your binder. Sir, tab 15 is Florida Exhibit 128. It's minutes from a meeting dated March 17, 2015. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do see that.
Q. And I believe these are from Sumter County, sir. Do you know where Sumter County is?
A. I do.
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Q. And that's in Georgia's portion of the ACF Basin?
A. It is.
Q. About 26 or 27 miles from where you live?
A. Give or take.
Q. Okay. Were you aware that Sumter County passed an ordinance to ban the watering of roads from irrigation systems?
A. I am not aware of that.
Q. Okay. Sir, if you turn about -- these pages are not numbered -- I don't think they are -they're not numbered sequentially; so it's about 13 pages into the document, sir. You will see a page that has the heading section Roman numeral XV.

MS. WINE: The next page, Mr. Walton.
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Sir, are you there?
A. Yes, ma'am; I'm there.
Q. And do you see the heading there says, Approval of an ordinance of the Sumter County Board of Commissioners governing agricultural irrigation systems for other lawful purposes?
A. I see it.
Q. Okay. Sir, if you look down -- I know the print is small; we'll try to blow it up on the screen THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

23 A. One second. to yourself, sir.
A. I see that.
A. I see that sentence. Correct?
A. I'm reading it.
Q. Okay.
Q. Take your time, sir.
as well. There's a few whereas clauses. The third one establishes what we're talking about, irrigation systems that are diverting water onto the roads. And if you could look at the last two whereas clauses on that page and just read those
Q. And, sir, do you see that Sumter enacted an ordinance regarding the diversion of water onto roadways from agricultural irrigation systems because they needed to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens?
Q. And they also cited this practice as a waste of valuable water resources?
A. I see that sentence as well.
Q. And, sir, if you just look on the next page, section 161 , that's where they actually ban the watering of roads from irrigation systems.
A. I have read section 161.
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various levels that you just described. I think they did 100 percent watering rate, 66 percent rate, 33 percent rate, and then looked at no irrigation at all. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And it looked at yield on impacts of various crops such as peanuts and cotton and corn. Correct?
A. Again, it looked at the yield as well as the crop quality and other growth characteristics of crop.
Q. Okay. And, sir, if you could please turn to tab 24 in your binder. Tab 24 is from JX-169. And, sir, do you see at the top of the page it says Shellman Farm peanut yield?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. Okay. And this table appears to contain yearly yield data. Correct?
A. I believe this is yield data. It's -- the numbers -- the chart doesn't say. But the numbers in the table generally reflect amounts consistent with peanut yield. I believe they are likely expressed in pounds per acre.
Q. Okay. And then you'll see that the column headings show the sprinkler rate levels that we just discussed?
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A. I believe that is what the columns reflect, yes.
Q. And on the bottom row, there appear to be an average of the data that's above from the various years; is that correct?
A. I have no way to confirm that that is the average without, you know, a calculator.
Q. Okay.
A. I'm not -- I don't know that I could do that average in my head on the stand.

I believe that that is reflective of the average of the years shown, yes.
Q. And, sir, in general the table seems to show that yield decreases somewhat as less irrigation is applied. Correct?
A. The table seems to show that across all years, 2001 to 2014, yields were reflective of certain dry years, certain wet years across the range of those years as well as across all of the different rotations that the researchers are looking at at Shellman, which is not necessarily broken out here. This appears to be an aggregate of all of the peanut data. And so understanding that there's, you know, a lot more nuance to this data, generally speaking the yields decrease as you move down the irrigation treatments from full THE REPORTING GROUP
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irrigation or 100 percent to dry-land.
Q. And, sir, if you could please turn the page. And you will see this is that same chart which we have modified slightly to add some bolded entries at the bottom right. Do you see that?

We have highlighted them on the screen.
A. I see that.
Q. And, sir, what we did -- and I didn't bring a calculator; so, hopefully, you will trust me -is we took the 100 percent yield number, and we computed what percentage of that 100 percent yield would remain if irrigation were applied at the 66 percent rate irrigation level and the 33 percent irrigation level. Do you -- are you following me on that?
A. I'm following you on that, yes.
Q. Okay. And then do you see here -- and I understand you're taking my word on the math -that the data shows that if irrigation is applied at a 66 percent rate, the peanut yield would still be 96.1 percent of what it would have been at 100 percent irrigation?
A. So I think we're -- I agree with -- and I will accept your representation that the math is correct. The -- what we're looking at is an THE REPORTING GROUP
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average of some averages at a research farm operated by the USDA. And so I think it's important to keep in mind that how the logistics of making irrigation management decisions and the ability to really target those irrigation management decisions at a few acres on a research farm is likely not the same, and I can testify that it is not the same as the challenges that farmers face in the real world making irrigation decisions.

But I do see the numbers at the bottom of the page.
Q. And -- thank you. And I'm just asking about this study right now.

You will also see that we computed that even at 33 percent irrigation rate, you would still get 84.9 percent of the yield that you would get under 100 percent irrigation rate. Correct?
A. Again, under the conditions at the research farm, that appears to be correct.
Q. Okay. And, sir, we have done the same in the following pages for cotton crop. And I won't belabor that now, but that's just what you will find in the rest of that tab.

Sir, I want to switch topics for a moment and THE REPORTING GROUP
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talk about the issuance of agricultural permits.
Okay?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Now, sir, you're familiar with the Flint River Regional Water Development Conservation Plan. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am; I am.
Q. I think folks have referred to that in this trial as the 2006 plan. Is that a term you're familiar with?
A. That would be fine with me.
Q. Okay, sir. For the record, the plan is found on -- the 2006 plan is found behind tab 14 in your binder. It's JX-21 for the record.

You were an adviser on the 2006 plan. Correct?
A. I was a member of the Technical Advisory Committee for this plan, yes.
Q. And the 2006 plan divided the Lower Flint River Basin into three differ use zones. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am; it did.
Q. And, sir, if we could turn to page 25 in this document, you will see there that there is a map that I believe is depicting the three use zones; is that correct?
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A. It appears to be, yes, ma'am.
Q. And the three categories are capacity use areas which are denoted in red. I know the legend is difficult to see. Is that correct?
A. Yes, ma'am. I believe the red watersheds on this map are reflective of what were deemed capacity use areas.
Q. And the restricted use areas are denoted in yellow. Is that correct?
A. Yes, ma'am. I believe that's correct.
Q. And then there are conservation use areas denoted in green. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am. That's correct.
Q. And a big consideration in determining where those zones are drawn was impact on streamflow. Correct?
A. That was my understanding, yes.
Q. And this 2006 plan imposed some conservation measures on future agricultural permits issued in all three use zones. Correct?
A. I believe that's correct. Yes.
Q. Now, the plan, while imposing those restrictions, at the same time lifted an earlier moratorium on new permits that had been in place prior to this point; is that correct?

THE REPORTING GROUP
A. As I recall following adoption of the 2006 plan, the permits that were submitted to Georgia EPD prior to December of 1999 -- or I believe you have termed them the backlogged permits -- were issued following adoption of this plan, yes.
Q. Right. But prior to that, there had been a moratorium on the issuance of new permits. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay.
A. There was a moratorium put in place, I believe it was in December of 1999.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, if you could turn to your prefiled direct testimony, page 18, paragraph 55.
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Are you there?
A. Yes, ma'am; I'm there.
Q. Okay. I was just giving you a moment.

You will see in the second sentence there you say that permits issued for new irrigation withdrawals since the adoption of the 2006 plan have been almost entirely for groundwater withdrawals from aquifers other than the Floridan Aquifer or in areas where the Sound Science Study showed that groundwater withdrawals had little to THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart no impact on streamflow.
Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do see that.
Q. And do you stand by that testimony today?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. Sir, I would like you to turn to tab 27 in your binder.

And, sir, you're familiar with Georgia's agricultural permitting database; is that correct?
A. Generally speaking, I am.
Q. Okay. And I'll represent that this is information that we have compiled from JX-132, which is the agricultural permitting database.

Now, you're aware that that database contains records of permits issued by Georgia EPD for agricultural water withdrawals?
A. That is my understanding of what is contained in the Ag permitting database, yes.
Q. And you're aware that for most permits the database contains the permit issue date?
A. That is my understanding, yes.
Q. And what we have done here is we have compiled data from the database, and we identified all permits issued in the Flint River Basin
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A. I'm not fully aware of all of the requirements of
Florida's agricultural water withdrawal
permitting system or in the Northwest Florida
Water Management District. I have been told that
certain agricultural water withdrawal permits
have some volumetric cap, yes.
Q. And, sir, were you in the courtroom when
Mr. Brett Cyphers testified?
A. No, ma'am; I was not.
Q. And have you read Mr. Cyphers's prefiled direct
testimony in this case?
A. Yes, ma'am; I have.
Q. And do you recall seeing a reference in his
prefiled direct testimony on such a cap?
A. I recall -- I recall language in Mr. Cyphers's
prefiled direct testimony regarding certain
modeled amounts for anticipated water use by
certain crops under certain conditions. It's my
understanding that that in some way informs how
the Northwest Florida Management District permits
their Ag users.
Q. Are you aware that Florida requires the farmers
in its portion of the ACF Basin to employ deficit
irrigation techniques?
A. I don't recall that being a requirement. I THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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recall language concerning some modeled amount of water that may reflect some reduction over another modeled amount that informs their permitting requirements. But I'm not sure to the degree that that is necessarily deficit irrigation.
Q. Okay. Well, are you aware that, in fact, Florida farmers are only allowed to use water they need for optimal growth of crops 80 percent of the time?
A. I'm not aware of all of the permit requirements in Florida.
Q. You don't recall reading that in Mr. Cyphers' prefiled direct testimony?
A. Not specifically. I remember the number 80 percent, but I don't remember the exact context.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, going back to your slide presentation that's found behind tab 20, which is FX-908, could you please turn to the next slide, which is slide 5. And it's titled Milestones in Management.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see, sir, that in the third bullet point there there is a reference to the Flint River Drought Protection Act of 2000?
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A. I do see that, yes.
Q. And you understand that the Flint River Drought Protection Act established an auction process in which Georgia can buy out farmers' rights to irrigate in times of drought. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you agree that the Flint River Drought Protection Act was a milestone in agricultural water management. Correct?
A. I think in terms of the development of Georgia's agricultural management and the policies that govern agricultural water management, the passage of the Flint River Drought Protection Act was in fact a milestone, yes.
Q. And you have called it a central management practice of Georgia. Correct?
A. As I recall, the Flint River Drought Protection Act was referenced in the 2006 water plan to -excuse me, 2006 plan, I believe, is the term we agreed to use. And it's referenced I believe in other plans including the regional water plans of the Upper and Lower Flint Councils. I believe that it is certainly a management tool that the State has at its disposal.
Q. And, sir, parts of Georgia's portion of the ACF THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart region are currently experiencing a drought. Correct?
A. I am aware of certain regions in the State of Georgia that are experiencing a drought. And as I recall, certain regions of southwest Georgia are in drought conditions as defined by NOAA, yes.
Q. And were you in the courtroom when former EPD Director Judson Turner testified last week?
A. No, ma'am; I don't believe I was.
Q. Have you read his testimony about the possibility of the Flint River Drought Protection Act being utilized in 2017 if the drought continues?
A. No, ma'am; I am not.
Q. Sir, in the event that the drought continues into

2017, would you expect that the Georgia EPD should invoke the Flint River Drought Protection Act as one of its managements tools?
A. I'm not sure what \(I\) would expect some six months down the road. I'm not sure. I don't want to speculate.
Q. Okay, sir. If you could, going back to your presentation behind tab 20 of FX-908. And, sir, please turn to slide 15. And, sir, you will see on this slide under conservation it says THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


Conservation in Georgia. Do you see that?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. And the first paragraph describes a project that's referred to as IrrigatorPro. Do you see that?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. And, sir, you're familiar with that project. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am; I am.
Q. And how were you involved in that project?
A. If this is the same proposal that is in my mind, this was a joint project that I co-authored along with folks at the USDA National Peanut Research Lab and the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission. And it was a proposal to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and their conservation innovation grants. And it was, as I recall, a proposal to secure funding to incentivize the use of IrrigatorPro irrigation scheduling software.
Q. Okay. And, sir, if you turn to the page ending in 847 -- those are the small numbers at the bottom right of the page -- you will see a reference to you in the last bullet. Correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
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Q. And, sir, did you say that you had a role in actually drafting this document?
A. I recall seeing this document in its draft form, yes.
Q. You saw it in a draft form. Were you actually one of the drafters or editors of the document?
A. I believe I was, yes.
Q. Okay, sir. If you look to the next page, the page ending in 848, do you see there is a section entitled Project Benefits and Transferability?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. And, sir, if you look three-quarters of the way down the paragraph, there is a sentence that starts upstream communities. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And, sir, could you just read that sentence to yourself.
A. I see that.
Q. So, sir, in this document you were recognizing that downstream communities, including the Apalachicola estuary and oyster fisheries, would also benefit from improved water resource management upstream in Georgia. Correct?
A. I do see that sentence in the proposal, yes.
Q. And you agree with that sentence. Correct?
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A. I believe that in terms of overall reductions to the degree that they benefit certain regions or -- let me rephrase.

I agree that it's possible that reductions could benefit some segments of the entire basin, yes.
Q. You actually say they will benefit in this document. Correct?
A. I believe that is what the sentence says, yes.
Q. Thank you, sir.

Could you go back to page -- sorry, tab 20, which is your presentation again, Exhibit FX-908.

And I would to return to slide 15 which we were looking at before. Let me know when you're there, sir.
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. We spoke about -- under conservation, we spoke about irrigation scheduling. The next item is precision application strategies. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. And, sir, you agree that something called variable rate irrigation can be an example of a precision application strategy. Correct?
A. I believe it could, yes. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
Q. And variable rate irrigation is sometimes referred to as VRI?
A. It is.
Q. And VRI systems can vary the amount of water applied by cycling sprinklers on and off, controlling the end-gun, and varying the center-pivot travel speed; is that correct?
A. That's generally correct, yes.
Q. And that was all described by Dr. Irmak in his expert report. Correct?
A. It may have. I believe he -- Dr. Irmak did, in fact, discuss VRI, yes.
Q. And, sir, do you agree that VRI could increase agricultural water efficiency in Georgia by approximately 15 percent?
A. I don't know that I agree necessarily that VRI across the board could increase -- could decrease overall consumption by 15 percent or increase efficiency. I, again, very much like your irrigation schedule question, believe that is a farm-to-farm, farmer-to-farmer type of analysis.
Q. Do you recall reading in Dr. Irmak's report that he said that VRI on average can reduce water use by more than 15 percent?
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A. I don't remember that specific statement in his report, no.
Q. Do you recall reading anything from the Stripling Irrigation Research Farm that also says that VRI systems can result in water savings of up to 15 percent?
A. I recall the Stripling Irrigation Park putting together -- seems like a one-or-two-page summary of various conservation measures that had certain percentages attached to them. I can't say that I specifically remember the one about VRI.
Q. Okay. But you have no reason to dispute here today that they associated 15 percent reduction in water use to VRI?
A. I have no reason to dispute their association.
Q. Okay, sir. If we could go back one more time to tab 20 and to slide 37.

I'm sorry. Before I go there, I just want to make clear that Georgia doesn't currently mandate the use of VRI systems. Correct?
A. No, ma'am, Georgia does not mandate the use of VRI systems.
Q. Okay. Now, if you could turn to slide 37, which is titled Pivot System Conservation Methods. Are you there, sir?
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A. Yes, ma'am. I'm on page 37.
Q. I just wanted to make sure.
A. Yes.
Q. And if you will look, the second big bullet about two-thirds of the way down the page says Variable Rate Irrigation, VRI. Do you see that?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. And it identifies five systems for 1,064 acres. Correct?
A. That is what is on this PowerPoint slide.
Q. Right.
A. I believe --
Q. I'm sorry.
A. Well, no. I just want to be clear as to the context. This was a summary of a very specific mapping project in a very specific small watershed.
Q. Okay. And based on that mapping project, you were able to identify as of that time in 2013 only five parcels that were using a VRI system. Correct?
A. Of the region mapped and from the data reflected from that mapping for that small watershed, that is correct.
Q. And you have since done your more advanced
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mapping of irrigation in Georgia. Correct?
A. We have completed field verification on a significant portion of the acreage in the Flint River Basin; and we have mapped all of the acreage in the state, yes.
Q. And are you aware that your field mapping shows that now there are only 10 farmers using VRI systems in Georgia?
A. I don't -- I honestly don't remember exactly the numbers in that full mapping database.
Q. You have no reason to dispute that number though. Correct?
A. Not sitting here right now, no.
Q. Okay. And the VRI systems, they are indicated on your database of the mapped information. Correct?

If there is one, it's demoted by VRI equals \(Y\) in your code; is that correct?
A. I don't know exactly what the code says. I do recall that whether or not a system was shown to have VRI technology was captured as part of our mapping work -- excuse me, field verification work, yes.
Q. Okay, sir. If you would, for a moment, would you turn to your prefiled direct testimony at THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
page 21. And you will see there's a demo there that's labeled Masters demo 6. Do you see that, sir?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. And this is a table summarizing the breakdown of the types of irrigation systems in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee water planning region. Correct?
A. I want to be very careful and make sure that I'm answering you correctly. So there were a number of tables. I just want to read that real quick --
Q. Sure thing.
A. -- if you don't mind.

Yes. I believe Masters demo 6 reflects the change in irrigation systems and type as well as acreage in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee water planning region.
Q. Okay. And just adding up the number column under 2015 -- do you see that right in the middle of your chart?

It looks like you're reporting on a total of, you know -- I think it's 11,370 systems. Does that math sound right?
A. That appears to be close. THE REPORTING GROUP
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\\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Q. And almost 1900 of those systems are traveler irrigation systems. Correct?
A. In the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee planning region, correct.
Q. Correct. And that's about 17 percent of those systems?
A. I haven't done the math on the percentage.
Q. Okay. And in your prefiled direct you say that the traveler irrigation systems are less efficient than the center-pivot and drip irrigation systems. Correct?
A. Overall that is correct.
Q. Okay. And so there's some room for efficiency improvement here if we convert at least some of those traveler systems to center-pivot or drip systems?
A. I believe that traveler irrigation systems are largely used on smaller acreage where they are most -- that's what they were designed to do is irrigate relatively small tracts of land. So I would say that conversion of certain traveler fields to center-pivot fields is not necessarily achievable.

What I also think this shows is that overall, there is a trend away from irrigating fields with THE REPORTING GROUP
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less efficient travelers to more efficient irrigation systems.

The other thing I think I would point out, if you don't mind --
Q. No, not at all.
A. -- is in the Lower Flint-Ochlockonee planning region -- and I don't have the numbers exactly off the top of my head -- I believe what you find is that a significant portion of these traveler systems are actually in the Ochlockonee watershed as opposed to the Flint watershed.
Q. Sir, you're not saying that there is no room for further efficiency here by converting some of the traveler systems. Correct?
A. No, ma'am; I'm not.
Q. Okay. And you also speak -- and I'm not going to belabor it here. You and Dr. Irmak speak about different pressures, sprinklers, and nozzle heads and some at least modest room for improvement that still exists there. Correct?
A. I believe that I mentioned that in my prefiled direct, yes.
Q. And, sir, you also talk in your prefiled direct about the Mobile Irrigation Lab as a conservation action that Georgia has taken. Correct?
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A. I believe in my prefiled direct I make mention of the Mobile Irrigation Lab that has been in large part funded through the Soil and Water Conservation Commission that has assisted farmers in capturing information about the uniformity of their systems as well as supporting certain retrofit programs administered by the State and USDA.
Q. And what do you mean by the uniformity of their systems?
A. So in general, the Mobile Irrigation Lab goes out and tests farmers' uniformity of application, the uniformity in terms of water delivery of the irrigation system to the field, and then can make recommendations on ways to improve that uniformity.
Q. And, sir, you're aware that Dr. Irmak reports that the Mobile Irrigation Lab inspections result in an improvement in average uniformity from 73.5 percent to an average of 85 percent. Correct?
A. I don't remember the specific numbers. I believe you're representing that to me as part of his report. I have no reason to doubt that.
Q. Do you recall that in his report he says that this Mobile Irrigation Lab program has helped THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Georgia save approximately 965 million gallons of water per growing season?
A. I recall some type of chart along those lines in his report, yes.
Q. Okay. And the Mobile Irrigation Lab program also will sometimes go out and install end-gun shutoffs on farmers' center-pivots. Correct?
A. I believe that has been one of the functions of the Mobile Irrigation Lab, yes.
Q. And do you recall that Dr. Irmak reported that an additional 232 million gallons of savings resulted in the growing season as a result of the installation of end-gun shutoffs by the Mobile Irrigation Lab?
A. Again, \(I\) don't remember the specific numbers in Dr. Irmak's report.
Q. Okay. Now, based on your mapping work, you know that almost all of the center-pivots in the Lower Flint River Basin now have end-guns. Correct?
A. The majority of center-pivots in the Flint River Basin do have end-guns, yes.
Q. I think it's something like 99 percent; does that sound right?
A. I -- that would not surprise me. I believe that's -- that's accurate, yes.
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\hline 36 & 367 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Q. And the Mobile Irrigation Lab only visits farmers at the request of a farmer; is that correct? \\
A. I believe the Mobile Irrigation Lab does, in fact, make visits at the request of farmers. I'm also aware that the Mobile Irrigation Lab over time, dating back to the early 2000's, supported a number of incentive programs administered by the USDA as well as the State of Georgia. And so those visits to those particular farmers would have been made in conjunction with those incentive programs, not necessarily just at the request of the farmer. \\
Q. Do you recall that Dr. Irmak reported that only about 560 center-pivots in all of Georgia had been serviced or retrofitted by the Mobile Irrigation Lab? \\
A. I don't remember that number, no. \\
Q. And do you know that less than half of those that were visited were actually in the sensitive areas of the Lower Flint River Basin? \\
A. I don't have any recollection of exactly where the Mobile Irrigation Lab has completed farm visits. \\
Q. Are you aware that there's about 10,000 center-pivots in the State of Georgia? \\
THE REPORTING GROUP \\
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A. I was not aware of the percentage of those total systems. I recall some number in Dr. Cyphers's prefiled direct, but I don't remember exactly what it was. \\
Q. And do you recall reading that Florida has, in fact, serviced most of those twice? \\
A. I recall something to that effect, yes. \\
Q. Do you know how many physical Mobile Irrigation Labs Georgia has? \\
A. No, ma'am; I don't. \\
Q. Does two sound about right? \\
A. I know that there's one stationed at the Hooks Hanner Environmental Resource Center that is located in Terrell County, Georgia. I know there is a team stationed there. Beyond that, I'm not altogether sure. \\
Q. Did you know that Florida has 17 Mobile Irrigation Labs? \\
A. I don't know what all Florida has. \\
Q. Hold on one moment, sir. \\
Sir, if you would for a moment, turn back to slide 20 in your presentation. That's behind tab 20. It's the one that we have been looking at through the course of this portion of the testimony. And, sir, this is just an expansion THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
A. I believe so, yes. \\
Q. And about 9,000 of those center-pivots are in the Lower Flint River Basin. Correct? \\
A. I believe there are slightly less than 9,000 center-pivots in the entire ACF Basin. \\
Q. Okay. And only 560 of those were visited by the Mobile Irrigation Lab? \\
A. Well, again, I'm not sure of the data that Dr. Irmak was referencing. You have represented to me that that was in his report. I don't know the timing of that data. I don't know anything about that data. \\
Q. Do you know how many center-pivots there are in Florida? \\
A. Approximately, yes. \\
Q. And what's that number? \\
A. As I recall from Dr. Cyphers's prefiled direct, there are approximately \(\mathbf{4 5 0}\) or \(\mathbf{5 0 0}\) pivots. \\
Q. And you know that Florida also has a Mobile Irrigation Lab program; don't you? \\
A. I am aware of that, yes. \\
Q. Do you know that in Florida's portion of the ACF Basin the Mobile Irrigation Lab program has inspected about 80 percent of the irrigation systems in Florida? \\
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of your slide pulling up additional options under Ag management. Okay, sir? \\
And you will see that the first bolded bullet now on this slide says Emergency Powers. Do you see that? \\
A. I do. \\
Q. And, sir, could you tell me what you're referring to in that bullet? \\
A. It's my understanding that there are certain emergency powers that the State may have regarding suspension of any type of water use during extreme drought conditions. \\
Q. Okay. And you were citing that as an agricultural management option available to the State of Georgia? \\
A. I think what I was attempting to do in this slide -- and, honestly, this presentation is -actually tells a very good story about how Georgia's agricultural water management has evolved since 1999 or 2000. \\
The point of this slide was to say that that is one potential option that is in -- within Georgia's statute as a possible tool, yes. \\
Q. And a couple bullets down you also cite statute changes. Correct? \\
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\hline & 3680 & & 3682 \\
\hline 1 & A. I do see that, yes. & 1 & are abundantly good stewards of the water \\
\hline 2 & Q. And what did you mean by that? & 2 & resources within the State of Georgia. And I \\
\hline 3 & A. So statute changes, I believe, is something that & 3 & think as we talk about some of the potential \\
\hline 4 & is always on the table for management of really & 4 & strategies that could come down on Georgia \\
\hline 5 & anything, not just Ag water use. & 5 & agriculture, I think it's just important to \\
\hline 6 & Q. Okay. And, sir, the last bullet point you say, & 6 & remember that, you know, you're talking about \\
\hline 7 & demand management equals exposure to individuals, & 7 & exposure to individuals. \\
\hline 8 & dot, dot, dot, to what end? & 8 & Q. And, sir, you talk about those individuals in \\
\hline 9 & Sir, what did you mean by that bullet? & 9 & your prefiled direct testimony. And you say that \\
\hline 10 & A. What I meant by that is agricultural water use is & 10 & they are able to actually provide stability to \\
\hline 1 & somewhat unique. And so when there are & 11 & themselves because they can irrigate. Correct? \\
\hline 12 & discussions of management or caps or reductions & 12 & That's in paragraph 20 of your prefiled \\
\hline 13 & to water use or anything like that, particularly & 13 & direct testimony. You say, irrigation helps \\
\hline 14 & when it's the product of some modeling & 14 & provide farmers stability in yield and crop \\
\hline 15 & assumptions or whatever, I think there's a real & 15 & quality. Correct? \\
\hline 16 & danger in not understanding what the true impact & 16 & A. That's correct. \\
\hline 17 & of that could be. When we talk about reducing & 17 & Q. And your position is that that stability is \\
\hline 18 & water use to agriculture, you're talking about & 18 & important to farmers. Correct? \\
\hline 19 & reducing water use to folks like me and my & 19 & A. I think stability in any business is important. \\
\hline 20 & neighbors. And so that impact is directly felt & 20 & Q. And, sir, the oystermen in the oyster industry in \\
\hline 21 & by an individual, by a person. It's not spread & 21 & Apalachicola Bay, they don't have any ability to \\
\hline 22 & out over some larger entity. And so that would & 22 & stabilize their crops by pulling fresh water out \\
\hline 23 & have to be absorbed by individuals, individual & & of some system. Correct? \\
\hline 24 & farmers. & 24 & A. I'm not sure to the degree that fresh water is \\
\hline 25 & \begin{tabular}{l}
And the point about to what end \(I\) think is THE REPORTING GROUP \\
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\hline & 3681 & & 3683 \\
\hline 1 & important. I think Georgia had -- Georgia & 1 & oysters in Apalachicola Bay. \\
\hline 2 & farmers have done an extraordinary job of coming & 2 & I'm not an expert necessarily on Apalachicola \\
\hline 3 & to the table in terms of developing Ag water & 3 & Bay. I am testifying about the sustainability \\
\hline 4 & management strategies and practices. But I & 4 & and the stewardship of water resources in \\
\hline 5 & think -- and not speaking for all the farmers, & 5 & Georgia. \\
\hline 6 & but since I'm here in this court to at least & 6 & Q. Sir, the oyster industry is dependent upon the \\
\hline 7 & speak on my behalf, I think they want to see to & 7 & freshwater flows that are coming down; and that's \\
\hline 8 & what degree all of this is going to benefit & 8 & entirely dependent on the upstream uses. \\
\hline 9 & someone else. If they're going to be exposed to, & 9 & Correct? \\
\hline 10 & you know, a much increased risk of decreased & 10 & A. I don't know that that is necessarily correct, \\
\hline 11 & yields or decreased quality or going out of & 11 & no. \\
\hline 12 & business, they want to see to what end. & 12 & Q. Sir, I would like to just finish up by addressing \\
\hline 13 & Q. And, sir, the impact that you just described to & 13 & some of the critiques that you outline in your \\
\hline 14 & farmers in your community, that's not much & 14 & prefiled direct testimony regarding Georgia's \\
\hline 15 & different than the impact, for example, that can & 15 & expert, Dr. Sunding. Do you recall those \\
\hline 16 & be felt by the oystermen in Apalachicola Bay. & 16 & critiques? \\
\hline 17 & Correct? & 17 & A. Can you point me to a location in my direct? \\
\hline 18 & A. I don't know to the extent about impacts to & 18 & Q. Sure. Prefiled direct, paragraph 48. \\
\hline 19 & oystermen. I have heard of impacts to oystermen. & 19 & A. Yes, ma'am; I see that. \\
\hline 20 & I think that agricultural water users, as I & 20 & Q. Okay, sir. And you state that you have -- you're \\
\hline 21 & said, have done an admirable job of coming to the & 21 & referencing the agricultural metering database; \\
\hline 22 & table to support the development of really good & 22 & and you state that you have reviewed the data for \\
\hline 23 & Ag management practices. I think the data & 23 & three farms with irrigation depths above 50 \\
\hline 24 & shows -- let me rephrase. & 24 & inches per acre that were provided by Florida to \\
\hline 25 & \begin{tabular}{l}
I know the data shows in Georgia that farmers \\
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\hline & & 3684 & & & 3686 \\
\hline 1 & & during his deposition. Do you see that? & 1 & & have asked me about analysis Dr. Sunding did. \\
\hline 2 & A. & I do see that, yes. & 2 & & It's my understanding he did a lot of analyses, \\
\hline 3 & Q. & And you state that in those -- those instances & 3 & & and I just didn't know which one you were \\
\hline 4 & & were examples of a meter measuring farmers & 4 & & referring to. \\
\hline 5 & & irrigating multiple fields rather than farmers & 5 & Q. & Sir, do you know that Dr. Sunding accounted for \\
\hline 6 & & wasting water. Correct? & 6 & & whether a meter measured water that was used to \\
\hline 7 & A. & For those specific instances that were & 7 & & irrigate multiple fields? \\
\hline 8 & & highlighted in the document presented to & 8 & A. & I'm not sure if Dr. Sunding did or not. I know \\
\hline 9 & & Dr. Stavins. As I recall, there was a point & 9 & & for a fact that there were at least three \\
\hline 10 & & being made that some of these farmers were & 10 & & instances on that exhibit that did not. \\
\hline 11 & & irrigating more than 50 inches. I happened to & 11 & Q. & Sir, you also state in your testimony that high \\
\hline 12 & & look at those three examples of the list; and for & 12 & & readings from the agricultural metering database \\
\hline 13 & & all three of those examples, the acreage & 13 & & could be from double-cropped acres rather than \\
\hline 14 & & associated with the meter was incorrect. And the & 14 & & wasted water. Is that right? \\
\hline 15 & & meter was actually serving more than one field, & 15 & A. & It's my testimony that double-cropping or \\
\hline 16 & & whereas, the -- whereas, in the data that was & 16 & & ulti-cropping can lead to irrigation depths \\
\hline 17 & & being used for this deposition example reflected & 17 & & assigned to particular crops that would overstate \\
\hline 18 & & only one field. It necessarily showed a higher & 18 & & the use associated with that crop. That is my \\
\hline 19 & & application rate than was actually being put on & 19 & & testimony. \\
\hline 20 & & the field. & 20 & Q. & Did you review the source code produced by \\
\hline 21 & Q. & And, sir, did you actually review Dr. Sunding's & 21 & & Dr. Sunding? \\
\hline 22 & & analysis; or did you just review these three & 22 & A. & No, ma'am; I did not. \\
\hline 23 & & example exhibits used during the Stavins & 23 & Q. & So you don't know whether the source code \\
\hline 24 & & deposition? & 24 & & accounts for any potential double-cropped acres; \\
\hline 25 & A. & I would not say I did a thorough review of & 25 & & do you? \\
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\hline 1 & & Dr. Sunding's analysis. I looked at this & 1 & A. & I did not review Dr. Sunding's source code. \\
\hline 2 & & example, certainly. & 2 & Q & kay. Thank you, sir. \\
\hline 3 & Q. & Did you -- & 3 & & MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, can I suggest a \\
\hline 4 & A. & I'm aware that it is not uncommon, depending on, & 4 & & five-minute break before we start redirect? \\
\hline 5 & & you know, the exchange of data in these databases & 5 & & SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You can \\
\hline 6 & & for meters to not be assigned exactly right to & 6 & & suggest it, yes. \\
\hline 7 & & the acreage in which they serve. & 7 & & (Time Noted: 1:33 p.m.) \\
\hline 8 & Q. & Did you review Dr. Sunding's analysis & 8 & & (Recess Called) \\
\hline 9 & & sufficiently to realize that he excluded from his & 9 & & (Time Noted: 1:38 p.m.) \\
\hline 10 & & analysis all irrigation depths greater than 50 & 10 & & MR. ALLEN: Ready when you are, your \\
\hline 11 & & inches? & 11 & & Honor. \\
\hline 12 & A. & Again, ma'am, all I did was I looked at one of & 12 & & REDIRECT EXAMINATION \\
\hline 13 & & the examples that was provided to Dr. Stavins. & 13 & & R. ALLEN: \\
\hline 14 & & I'm not sure what all Dr. Sunding looked at in & 14 & & Mr. Masters, thank you for your time this \\
\hline 15 & & his analysis. I know he modeled an awful lot & 15 & & afternoon. I have a few questions for you. \\
\hline 16 & & of things; but, again, I'm not sure what all & 16 & & Let's do our best to speak slowly so that \\
\hline 17 & & Dr. Sunding did. & 17 & & madam court reporter can take everything down. \\
\hline 18 & Q. & So the answer is, no, you don't realize that he & 18 & & Now, Mr. Masters, I know we talked earlier \\
\hline 19 & & actually excluded from his analysis all & 19 & & briefly that you work at the Water Policy \\
\hline 20 & & irrigation depths greater than 50 inches? & 20 & & Planning Center in Albany State. Can you just \\
\hline 21 & A. & Well, so I guess I should ask; in terms of which & 21 & & describe for us what that institution is and what \\
\hline 22 & & analysis? & 22 & & it does. \\
\hline 23 & Q. & Sir, I'm just asking you what you looked at. & 23 & A. & The Water Planning and Policy Center at Albany \\
\hline & A. & And I believe I have testified I looked at one & & & State was developed as part of a consortium of \\
\hline 25 & & exhibit that was provided to Dr. Stavins. You & 25 & & research institutes from a grant by the Georgia \\
\hline & & THE REPORTING GROUP & & & THE REPORTING GROUP \\
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\hline
\end{tabular}
legislature in 1999, I believe. The overall mission of the Water Policy Center is to provide information, technical resources to stakeholders, decision makers, policy makers in Georgia concerning water use and management.
Q. And, Mr. Masters, is part of the Center's work also to work with individual farmers in the ACF Basin?
A. It is.
Q. And what kind of work does the Center do with the farmers in the ACF?
A. So over the years we have completed a number of direct technical outreach and support projects aimed at improving on-farm water management, conservation planning, things of that nature. We have also, as we have discussed already today, supported a number of regional plans, water plans developed in the Flint Basin in southwest Georgia that involved a large degree of agricultural stakeholder involvement. So there's been a lot of work back and forth with individual farmers in the basin.
Q. And how many farmers would you say that you have worked with over the course of your career?
A. It's easily in the hundreds.
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> Q. And in addition to the Water Policy Planning Center, are there other institutions in or around the ACF Basin that also work with farmers in the ACF on water conservation?
A. Absolutely. So we have discussed one already today, and that's the University of Georgia, particularly their Stripling Irrigation Park located in the basin. The University of Georgia Extension Service also does a lot of work on-farm with growers to improve irrigation and water management. The Soil and Water Conservation Districts, I'm -- I happen to be a supervisor in the Lower Chattahoochee Soil and Water District. We do some outreach projects. The Flint District does a number of projects as well.
Q. Mr. Masters, as someone who lives in the ACF Basin and has worked with hundreds of farmers in the basin and has spent a decade or more working with these individuals and working in the agricultural arena, can you just tell us about the extent and the prevalence of agriculture and its importance to the region?
A. Sure. The fact of the matter is agriculture really is the lifeblood of southwest Georgia and the Flint River Basin. There's certainly
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economic -- it's incredibly important economically in terms of not just the production of individual farmers, but also the industries that that production supports in terms of the processing of agriculture commodities and things of that nature. So, certainly, jobs and employment, tax base, schools are all heavily dependent on Ag production in that part of the world.

I think it's also important to understand that beyond just those economic benefits, it really does -- agriculture really does kind of knit together the social fabric, if you will, of that part of the world. It's a really good place to grow agricultural commodities, and people have been doing it for generations. And so I think, again, just beyond that economic importance, it really is just important socially to that part of the world.
Q. And, Mr. Masters, we're obviously talking a lot in this case about agricultural irrigation. Can you just explain to us why farmers in ACF Georgia irrigate their crops?
A. Irrigation is, frankly, the best risk management tool that farmers have. In southwest Georgia it THE REPORTING GROUP
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is a very good place to grow things, for sure. We have a high degree of variability in our soils. We grow a lot of different things. And our summertime weather pattern is such that it's really hard to predict. Predicting the weather is tough under normal circumstance, but our weather pattern during the growing season is highly erratic. Irrigation allows farmers to bridge those gaps where they may not receive those summertime thunderstorms that crop up as in the course of our normal weather.

Having those dry times during the growing season can have a significant impact not on just the yield of the crop, but also the quality. And so I say it's a risk management strategy because it kind of helps guarantee to the degree possible that a good crop is going to be realized at the end of the growing season.
Q. Can you also describe for us the factors that go into a farmer's decision about whether or not to turn on their irrigation system on a particular day?
A. Sure. And there are a lot of them. Certainly, the growth stage of the plant, where is the plant, the crop, in terms of its development. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

That's a critical, important part of making the irrigation scheduling decision.

Also -- and we discussed it earlier -- the moisture in the soil. Is it drying out? Do we need to add supplemental irrigation?

And then obviously farmers are going to look at the forecast of rain in the future in making that irrigation -- whether or not to make the decision to go ahead and irrigate or not.
Q. Mr. Masters, at the beginning of the growing season does a farmer know how much water they're going to have to apply to their crops over the next couple months?
A. I think that would be impossible to know at the beginning of the growing season for a lot of the factors that I have already talked about. Farmers understand the total amount of water that it's going to take to kind of get a plant from, you know, planting to harvest. Knowing the future about how much of that is going to come from rainfall versus supplemental irrigation would be almost impossible.
Q. Now, Mr. Masters, Dr. Sunding, an expert for Florida in this case, has suggested that Florida could impose field-specific irrigation caps based THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

3693
on the crops being grown and the soil type and things like that. What's your reaction to that proposal?
A. I think that is fine as a modeling exercise in terms of estimating some potential savings from farmers having and applying perfect information in terms of their -- you know, all these factors that go into getting a crop from planting to harvest. The fact of the matter is growing a crop in southwest Georgia is a textbook definition of decision making with imperfect information. And so I think there's a danger there when assuming water savings or whatever, you know, assuming we have all of this perfect, nice, neat package in terms of what's actually happening out in the field.
Q. Mr. Masters, you were asked some questions on cross-examination about dry-land farming and what I'm going to call limited-irrigation farming; and I want to ask you about those. What's your understanding as to the circumstances under which dry-land farming occurs in the ACF Basin?
A. So as I mentioned earlier today, there are, in fact, acres grown as dry land, without irrigation. The thing I think that's important THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to understand is that those -- oftentimes those dry-land acres aren't out there in a vacuum, if you will. They are part of a farmer's overall portfolio of production.

And so many times what we see is a farmer will have a wide variety of acreage. Much of it irrigated, some of it dry land that goes into his overall portfolio of production. What I would submit is there are very few examples -- I can think of very few farmers that are growing crops in the Lower Flint Basin purely on a dry-land basis.
Q. Let me ask you about that. Why do you think there are so few examples of pure dry-land farming in the ACF Basin?
A. Because production under pure dry-land is inherently more risky. Growing a crop is an incredibly expensive proposition. And so as farmers attempt to secure financing early in the year to get them through from planting to harvest, the lenders are also looking at their portfolio of production. And they're going to be looking at their risk of providing an operating loan to these farmers. And so as a way to mitigate their risk, it's my understanding, just THE REPORTING GROUP
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talking to some folks I'm familiar with in the basin, that lenders are becoming less and less likely to provide operation financing to farmers that are irrigating purely on -- farming purely on a dry-land basis.
Q. Let's talk about some of the limited irrigation scenarios you were presented with. Do you remember you were shown some charts from Shellman Farm and some things about that and impacts on yields from reduced irrigation. Can you just tell us what risks do farmers face, if any, from having to irrigate with a limited or reduced irrigation requirement?
A. Well, so I think that also goes back to why farmers adopted irrigation in the first place. It was to bridge those times of, you know, reduced rainfall or dryness that are really common even in normal or wet years in southwest Georgia.

So attempting -- again, assuming we have this perfect information, to impose some type of limited irrigation regime sort of, \(I\) think, is -is dangerously detached from what's actually going on in the field in terms of farmers' decisions to irrigate. THE REPORTING GROUP
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Farmers, as a rule, are not out over-irrigating their crops. It makes no sense to do so.
Q. Let's talk about that for a second, if we can. Mr. Masters, in your experience do farmers in the ACF Basin in Georgia -- do they take steps to conserve their water use?
A. They absolutely do.
Q. Okay. And then before I ask you about what steps they take, what incentives do these farmers have, if any, to actually conserve their water use?
A. So I think the first incentive is the fact that irrigating is, in fact, a cost of production; it is also not free to irrigate. The equipment that they have installed on their farms to irrigate with is very expensive. The wells or service water sources that withdraw the water are expensive. And there is an actual cost of withdrawing water and applying it to their fields.

And so farmers, like any sort of rational agent, they're going to try to minimize their cost of production. So there is an economic incentive to conserve.

Beyond that, it doesn't make sense to drown THE REPORTING GROUP
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your crop in water. Crops respond to water on a curve, on a growth curve; and farmers understand that. It can be just as harmful to irrigate a crop too much as for a crop to not have enough water. And so, you know, from a crop development standpoint, it makes no sense to over-irrigate.
Q. Okay. And what specific steps do farmers take to actually conserve water?
A. So there are a number of them. And \(I\) think we can maybe categorize them in terms of maybe equipment and hardware steps. And some of those we have already discussed today.

There are also a number of steps in terms of just in-field and how they manage the growth of the plant that \(I\) think are also helpful.
Q. And have you actually seen these techniques actually implemented in the ACF Basin in Georgia?
A. Absolutely. So if we look at hardware, for example, nearly \(\mathbf{9 0}\) percent of the center-pivot systems in southwest Georgia in the Lower Flint Basin are already operating at low pressure. In other words, they are reaching near the highest percent of efficiency for center-pivot systems.

If we look at the other side of the ledger in THE REPORTING GROUP
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terms of things that they can do in the field to conserve, we're seeing -- and as I have already testified -- farmers adopted irrigation scheduling tools to better understand and apply water exactly when the crop needs it.

The final thing I would mention is conservation tillage. The State's Water Conservation Commission cooperates with the USDA on a research farm on conservation tillage and how that impacts water management. The fact is we're seeing for two of our major row crops, corn and cotton, a high adoption rate of conservation tillage, which also saves water.
Q. Mr. Masters, you were asked on cross-examination about some of the mapping work you have done in the ACF Basin. I just want to briefly cover that because I think you spoke about it a lot during your cross, and I just want to briefly cover a couple of topics.

One is what's the purpose of that mapping work? How is it used?
A. So if we look back in time, we see recommendations from stakeholders as well as the State that we need to get better information on exactly what acreage is being irrigated in the THE REPORTING GROUP
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basin. And so our mapping efforts, first and foremost, were an attempt to do that, get better information about exactly where the water is coming from and exactly how many acres the water is being applied to. So certainly that.

Better information necessarily helps the state as well as these regional water planning councils develop better estimates of agricultural demand and also informs the resource assessments that are part of their Regional Water Plans.
Q. All right. And how much of the irrigated acreage in the ACF Basin has, in fact, been mapped?
A. The Water Policy Center has mapped \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) percent of the acreage in the ACF Basin.
Q. All right. And we also discussed on cross some of your field verification work. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, sir; I do.
Q. And I want to talk about that briefly just so we all understand what that is. Can you tell us -what kinds of information does your team collect when they actually go out and do these field verifications?
A. Sure. First thing our team members would do on a field verification visit is go locate the source THE REPORTING GROUP
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & center-pivots -- do they all come alike in terms of efficiency? \\
\hline A. & No, sir; they do not. \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{Q.} & And if you look at demonstratives 3, 4, and 5 in your binder, there are pictures of different \\
\hline & types of center-pivot systems. And I would ask \\
\hline & if you could just briefly walk us through each of \\
\hline & these starting with tab 3, and tell us what we're \\
\hline & looking at there. \\
\hline \multirow[t]{11}{*}{A.} & Certainly. So on tab 3 of the binder, this is a somewhat typical irrigation system in southwest \\
\hline & Georgia that is operating at low pressure and has \\
\hline & been installed with drop nozzles. The reason \\
\hline & that is significant is the low pressure and \\
\hline & getting the water closer to the ground helps \\
\hline & prevent wind drift, in other words, wind blowing \\
\hline & the water out from where it needs to go, which is \\
\hline & to the crop, or evaporative loss. It gets the \\
\hline & water closer to the ground where the -- where it \\
\hline & can get to the beneficial use of the crap rather \\
\hline & than evaporate. \\
\hline Q. & And what kind of system is in tab 4? \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{A.} & In tab 4 this is an example of a low-pressure \\
\hline & irrigation system but where the water is emitted \\
\hline & from the top of the actual hardware itself. So \\
\hline & THE REPORTING GROUP \\
\hline & Mason \& Lockhart \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
instead of having a big sprinkler on top, it's a small little nozzle that just emits the water. And you can see it just sort of showers down around the actual hardware itself. Again, operating at low pressure, helping prevent loss from, you know, the wind blowing the water out of the field and also helps reduce evaporative loss as well.
Q. And what about tab 5?
A. So in tab 5 we see irrigation -- an irrigation system that is an example of a high-pressure impact type irrigation system. And so you can see there is also an end-gun installed on this particular example. So you can see right away that this irrigation system is actually throwing water much higher into the air. It operates at a much higher pressure in order to make those sprinklers actually work. And you do have an increased likelihood of evaporative loss because you're throwing water so much higher in the air, and you also have a more of a chance of that water getting blown out of the field by wind.
Q. And just generally, Mr. Masters, how do these three systems compare with one another in terms THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
of efficiency rates?
A. So, certainly, if we work backwards from tab 5, the high-pressure irrigation systems have a lower
efficiency than do these other lower pressure systems. I have seen literature that suggests high-pressure irrigation systems are \(\mathbf{7 0}\) to 75 percent efficient.

As we move back up through tabs 4 and 3, those low-pressure drop-nozzle systems, I have seen literature suggest they can be as high as 95 percent efficient. I think a good range would be 85 to \(\mathbf{9 0}\) percent efficient.
Q. And, Mr. Masters, as part of the field
verification, on-the-ground work that you did,
has your team identified rates of adoption with respect to low-pressure systems and high-pressure systems and other types of center-pivots?
A. Yes, sir; we have.
Q. And, sir, if you look with me at tab 6, is this something you all put together, sir?
A. Yes, sir; it is.
Q. And can you tell us what's being shown here?
A. Yes, sir. So in tab 6 there is a pie chart detailing both the number and the percentage of the center-pivot systems that we field-verified THE REPORTING GROUP
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in the Lower Flint. So we accounted for nearly 4800, approaching 5,000 center-pivot systems. We went out and actually touched them in these -in these heavily Ag use areas of southwest Georgia.

What we found is that almost 90 percent of the center-pivot irrigation systems in southwest Georgia are utilizing low-pressure technology.
Q. And is that significant to you, sir?
A. It is significant. We have discussed that the low-pressure technology and certainly the low-pressure drop technology which you see is actually installed on approaching 3,000 center-pivot irrigation systems, or about 60 percent is a higher efficiency. There is less loss from those systems as opposed to the high-pressure systems, which accounts for only about \(\mathbf{1 0}\) percent of the systems in south Georgia.
Q. And, sir, can you look at tab 7. It's a similar pie chart, but it's a little different. Can you explain to us what's being shown in tab 7 ?
A. Yes, sir. So what is in tab 7 is a subset of the data that was in tab 6. So we have talked a lot about capacity use areas, the red zones, in southwest Georgia. Those are the areas that the THE REPORTING GROUP
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Sound Science Study suggested that -- where pumping had the most impact on streamflow.

So if we really drilled down to just those regions -- and I would remind you that we have actually field-verified \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) percent of those systems. If you drill down, what you find is that 93 percent of the irrigation systems are operating with low-pressure technology; and about 60 percent of those using the low-pressure drops that we saw in tab 3, I believe.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Masters. I want to talk about a different topic.

You can set your binder aside. We're done with that.

Mr. Masters, you were asked, I think, a question or two about the agricultural metering program. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, sir; I do.
Q. What is that program?
A. The agricultural metering program was a result of legislation adopted by the Georgia General Assembly in 2003. Pursuant to that legislation, the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission began installing flowmeters on all permitted agricultural withdrawals in the State THE REPORTING GROUP
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of Georgia.
Q. And do you know how many meters have been installed statewide?
A. I believe the commission has installed over \(\mathbf{1 2 , 0 0 0}\) flowmeters statewide.
Q. And just in the ACF Basin, do you know that number?
A. I believe it's around \(\mathbf{6 , 0 0 0}\).
Q. And do you know what percentage of irrigation systems in the Lower Flint River Basin are metered?
A. In the Lower Flint River Basin approximately 77 percent, 78 percent of the systems are metered. And if you look at that in terms of the acreage, it's a little more than \(\mathbf{8 0}\) percent of the acreage is metered.
Q. And, sir, just so we're clear, how do you know that?
A. Because my team has gone and located those meters and touched those irrigation systems; and we have determined those percentages not by an estimate, but by actually going and collecting the data.
Q. All right. Mr. Masters, I want to end by going back to a topic we discussed at the very beginning of your cross-examination. And that
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was the ACFS Sustainable Water Management Plan.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And, sir, can you just describe for us what the
final recommendations were that were included in the ACF Sustainable Water Management Plan?
A. Well, sir, there were a number of recommendations as part of that plan, to be sure. I would say that the bulk of the recommendations that the stakeholders approved by consensus that they determined made the basin better off as a whole were related to the operation of the system by the Corps of Engineers. And so there was a suite of recommendations; and I believe, as I mentioned to Ms. Wine, that the stakeholders were clear that it was in fact a suite and not a menu of things to pick and choose from.

The suite of recommendations focused on essentially storing more water through changes in management during times when the water was available. So, for example, changing the rule curve at West Point Lake, having the Corps of Engineers better coordinate their releases in relation to some of their action zones. There was a recommendation regarding tweaks to hydropower releases; and there was, in fact -THE REPORTING GROUP
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given all of these other recommendations that helped to store water, there was also a recommendation that certain pulse flows be sent down into the Apalachicola River during certain periods of the year.
Q. Mr. Masters, I believe you mentioned that the bulk of the recommendations, some of them applied to the Corps. Right?
A. Yes, sir. That is correct.
Q. Do you have an understanding as to why that was?
A. I think the stakeholders realized through seven years of really hard deliberative work and a lot of technical work that in order to make the basin better off as a whole, they set up a bunch of performance metrics; and they -- that sort of guided their management decisions. They realized that in order to achieve a better basin across the board, including downstream, you can't extract the Corps of Engineers. The fact of the matter is in order to achieve similar performance metric goals downstream, one would have to make significant cuts to consumptive use. And in some cases you would have to cut all consumptive use in order to achieve similar performance metrics.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. Thank you, Mr. Masters.

MR. ALLEN: No further questions.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Ms. Wine?
MS. WINE: Just briefly, your Honor, a housekeeping item. I need to correct for the record the exhibit number of tab 20 in the book that I gave Mr. Merit -- Mr. Masters, which was his presentation -- slide presentation that we looked at. I said that it was Exhibit FX-908. It is actually FX-910. I just wanted to clarify that for the record. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. WINE:
Q. Mr. Masters, I think I just heard about three different analyses from you for which we have no documentation. And I just want to make sure I'm clear.

So, first, Georgia's counsel just asked you about your field verification. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, ma'am; I do.
Q. And, sir, are you aware that no documents have been produced to Florida regarding your field verification process?

THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. Honestly, ma'am, I'm not sure what all has been provided to the State of Florida. It's my understanding that all of the data that was collected as part of the discovery, which would have necessarily included all of that field verification work, was turned over. I -- that's the extent of my knowledge about what you may or may not have.
Q. So you're not aware that Georgia's counsel refused to produce that to us?
A. I'm not aware of anything of the sort.
Q. Okay. And, sir, in relation to tab 1 of the binder that Georgia's counsel just gave you, you said you did an analysis of the permits that were issued post-2006. Correct?
A. I believe I looked at an analysis of permits post-2000 as well as 2006.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. And you have not produced that analysis to us; have you?
A. I'm not sure what has been produced.
Q. Okay. We don't even have the results of your analysis here. Correct?
A. I don't believe there's a chart or anything THE REPORTING GROUP
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except for what is shown in tab 2 which, in fact, is the results -- a summary of the analysis that I performed regarding the information in tab 1.
Q. Okay. And sticking with tab 1 for a moment, you mentioned some inactive permits; is that correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Did you check whether those supposedly inactive permitted areas were actually being irrigated against your Ag watering database?
A. No, ma'am. What I did in this analysis was I looked exclusively at the database that I believe your team used to develop this table in tab 1, which is the EPD permit database. And I removed all of the permits that EPD had classified for one reason or another -- they were either revoked or never installed or whatever -- as inactive. I removed those because, you know, I felt that was the thing to do.
Q. Well, sir, there is a chance that the permitting database is not 100 percent complete or up to date. Correct?
A. I believe that the permit database has changes to it made on a regular basis.
Q. And so --
A. What I can tell you, however, is when I looked THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart 3719
at the results that you showed to Dr. Cowie and that you showed me earlier today, when I used that same database, I find that 440 of the permits were inactive; and \(I\) find that less than 1 percent of them are Upper Floridan capacity use withdrawals permitted since 2006.
Q. Well, sir, we went ahead and double-checked these supposedly inactive permitted acres against your wetted acreage database and found that most were actually being irrigated right now. You have no reason to dispute that. Correct?
A. Again, ma'am, I'm telling you that I have not done an analysis beyond trying to replicate what you all showed Dr. Cowie and then showed me earlier today. I have not done any analysis beyond that regarding wetted acreage or anything of the sort.
Q. Now, sir, if you turn to tab 2 in the binder that Georgia's counsel just gave you, sir, you have not produced to us any of the analysis that you did that supports this chart, correct, or this graph or whatever you want to call it?
A. Again, I -- I can't speak to what has been produced to you.
Q. Now, sir, you are not a hydrologist. Correct? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart










\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3565:6, 3614:13, & 3697:1, 3697:4, & 3693:12 & 3718:21 & decouple [1] - \\
\hline 3679:24, 3692:13, & 3697:5, 3698:5, & dangerously [1] - & dated [8] - 3524:19, & 3627:17 \\
\hline 3698:19, 3703:6 & 3708:18, 3722:2, & 3695:23 & 3594:3, 3603:2 & decrease [5] - \\
\hline course [6] - 3536:15, & 3722:3, 3722:5 & dark [1] - 3529:10 & 06:25, 3607:1 & 3517:17, 3561:16, \\
\hline 3652:19, 3678:24, & cropped [2] - 3686:13, & data [32] - 3531:7, & 3607:16, 3617:20, & 3574:14, 3633:24, \\
\hline 3688:24, 3691:11, & 3686:24 & 3531:9, 3564:24, & 3620:19 & 3667:17 \\
\hline 3704:4 & cropping [2] - & 3565:3, 3588:1, & dating [1] - 3676:6 & decreased [4] - \\
\hline courses [4] - 3519:9, & 3686:15, 3686:16 & 3589:1, 3612:1 & days [7]-3520:24, & 3565:8, 3565:13, \\
\hline 3521:18, 3523:2, & crops [18] - 3628:8, & 3626:14, 3626:16, & 3521:17, 3524:10, & 3681:10, 3681:11 \\
\hline 3525:24 & 3628:13, 3628:14, & 3626:18, 3632:17, & 26:6, 3526:8, & decreases [2] - \\
\hline court [5] - 3503:6, & 3630:25, 3632:7, & 3632:18, 3633:3, & 3526:9, 3526:14 & 3565:22, 3633:13 \\
\hline 3569:6, 3648:18, & 3656:18, 3657:9, & 3633:22, 3633:24, & daytime [1] - 3540:5 & decreasing [2] - \\
\hline 3681:6, 3687:17 & 3660:14, 3682:22, & 3634:19, 3639:24, & deal [2] - 3626:12, & 3561:21, 3562:22 \\
\hline COURT [1] - 3492:1 & 3686:17, 3690:23, & 3640:3, 3647:13, & 3725:13 & deducted [1] - \\
\hline Court [9] - 3492:12, & 3692:12, 3693:1, & 3669:22, 3677:8, & Deal [3] - 3524:11, & 3556:18 \\
\hline 3496:20, 3522:23, & 3694:10, 3696:2, & 3677:11, 3677:12, & \[
3524: 15,3524: 18
\] & deem [1] - 3700:6 \\
\hline 3527:23, 3528:14, & 3697:1, 3698:11 & 3681:23, 3681:25, & deals [1] - 3588:11 & deemed [1] - 3637:6 \\
\hline 3550:17, 3575:14, & Cross [1] - 3493:2 & 3683:22, 3684:16, & Dear [1] - 3607:23 & Defendants [1] - \\
\hline 3624:17, 3727:16 & cross [11] - 3538:18, & \[
3685: 5,3711: 23,
\] & debate [1] - 3608:23 & 3492:7 \\
\hline courtroom [5] - & \[
3554: 21,3568: 16,
\] & 3713:22, 3717:3, & decade [1] - 3689:18 & deficit [8] - 3629:20, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3551: 5,3589: 4, \\
& 3656.7 \text { з65a.8 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 3650:14, 3693:18, & 3720:18 & decades [1] - 3511:9 & 3629:22, 3630:9, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3656: 7,3659: 8, \\
& 3720: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3698: 14,3698: 18 \\
& 3699: 15,3703: 14,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { database [38] - } \\
& 3639: 9,3639: 14,
\end{aligned}
\] & December [3]- & \[
3630: 14,3630: 20,
\] \\
\hline cover [3] - 3623:18, & 3706:23, 3713:25 & 3639:15, 3639:19, & 3727:11 & 3657:5 \\
\hline 3698:16, 3698:18 & CROSS [2]-3496:1, & 3639:21, 3639:24, & decide [1] - 3663:9 & defined [5] - 3502:20, \\
\hline Cowie [4] - 3648:19, & 3571:22 & 3640:20, 3642:6, & decided [2] - 3600:13, & 3582:2, 3627:8, \\
\hline 3704:7, 3719:1, & CROSS- & \begin{tabular}{l}
3645:17, 3645:20, \\
3645:23, 3646.9
\end{tabular} & 3624:15 & \[
3644: 1,3659: 6
\] \\
\hline 3719:14 & EXAMINATION [2] & 3645:23, 3646:9, & decision [8] - 3516:9, & definite [1] - 3707:8 \\
\hline Cowie's [1] - 3648:17 & 3496:1, 3571:22 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3646: 16,3646: 18, \\
& 3646: 23.3647: 2 .
\end{aligned}
\] & 3527:11, 3597:21, & definitely [1] - 3516:4 \\
\hline CRAIG [1] - 3492:21 & \begin{tabular}{l}
cross-examination [6] \\
3554:21, 3650:14
\end{tabular} & 3646:23, 3647:2, & 3688:4, 3691:20, & definition [6] - 3498:4, \\
\hline crap [1] - 3708:20 & - 3554:21, 3650:14, & \[
347: 25,3648: 10
\] & 3692:2, 3692:9, & \[
3498: 6,3503: 11,
\] \\
\hline \[
3705: 3
\] & \[
3703: 14,3713: 25
\] & \[
3648: 11,3649: 5
\] & 3693:11 decisions [7] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3627: 6,3630: 9 \\
& 3693: 11
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline creation [1] - 3513:7 & CRR [2] - 3492:14, & 3649:14, 3649:16, & 3527:3, 3599:18 & definitions [1] - \\
\hline creek [1] - 3700:3 & 3727:15 & 3649:20, 3670:10, & 3635:4, 3635:6, & 3627:3 \\
\hline crisp [2] - 3494:6, & culmination [1] - &  & 3635:10, 3695:25, & degree [16] - 3603:25, \\
\hline 3494:7 &  & 04:15, 3718:9, & 3715:16 & 3607:9, 3610:12, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
criteria [1] - 3652:22 \\
critical [2] - 3625:21
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { cur } \\
35
\end{array}
\] & 3718:11, 3718:13, & \begin{tabular}{l}
declaration [6] - \\
3515.6
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3611: 18,3612: 3, \\
& 2677.72
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { critical [2] - 3625: } \\
& 3692: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & current [2] - 3523:25, & \[
718: 20,3718: 22
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
3515:6, 3516:8, \\
3525:7, 3525:16
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3627: 23,3646: 10 \\
& 3653: 14,3657: 5,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline critically [1] - 3705:8 & 3525:12 & 3719:3, 3719:9 & \[
3526: 19,3527: 1
\] & 3666:2, 3681:8, \\
\hline criticisms [6] - & curve [3] - 3697:2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
databases [2]- \\
3649•11, 3685.5
\end{tabular} & declare [2] - 3514:25, & 3682:24, 3688:19, \\
\hline \[
3594: 12,3607: 7,
\] & \[
3714: 21
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
3649:11, 3685:5 \\
dataset [24]-3583.22
\end{tabular} & 3516:10 & 3691:2, 3691:16, \\
\hline \[
3607: 12,3609: 3
\] & customers [3] -
\[
3539: 21,3540: 11
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { dataset [24]-3583:22, } \\
3586: 10,3589: 11,
\end{gathered}
\] & declared [18] - & 3722:18 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
3609: 14,3609: 23
\] \\
critiques [5] -
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3539: 21,3540: 11, \\
& 3544: 15
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3590: 22,3594: 12,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3511: 16,3511: 23 \\
& 3511: 25,3512: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { deliberative [1] - } \\
& 3715: 12
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { critiques [5] - } \\
& 3586: 10,3608: 9,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\text { cut [1] - } 37
\] & 3594:20, 3595:14, & 3511:25, 3512:16, &  \\
\hline 3609:6, 3683:13, & \[
\text { cuts [1] }-3715: 22
\] & 3595:16, 3597:22, & 3512:23, 3512:24, & 3579:8 \\
\hline 3683:16 & cycles [1] - 3549:6 & 3598:7, 3599:1, & \[
3515: 9,3515: 14
\] & delivered [2] - \\
\hline crop [30] - 3589:17, & cycling [1] - 3667:5 & 3599:7, 3599:16, & \[
3517: 3,3524: 7
\] & 3544:14, 3555:18 \\
\hline 3589:18, 3629:6, & Cyphers [1] - 3656:8 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3602: 4,3602: 12, \\
& 3603: 18,3604: 2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3524: 8,3525: 2
\] & delivery [2] - 3579:2, \\
\hline 3629:9, 3629:10, & Cyphers' [1] - 3657:13 & 3603:18, 3604:2,
3610:8, 3610:16. & \[
3525: 4,3525: 5
\] & 3674:13 \\
\hline 3629:11, 3629:17, & Cyphers's [4] - & \[
3611: 2
\] & 3525:8, 3527:1 & demand [14] - \\
\hline 3630:8, 3631:5, & \[
3656: 10,3656: 15
\] & \[
3611: 25,3612: 2
\] & declaring [2] - 3515:3, & \[
3512: 17,3528: 7
\] \\
\hline 3632:9, 3632:10, & 3677:17, 3678:2 & 3612:7 & \[
3527: 4
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3528: 8,3562: 10 \\
& 3562: 13,3563: 22
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 3686:18, 3691:10, & D & datasets [2]-3598:20 & 3505:17, 3536:11, & 3594:25, 3595:9, \\
\hline 3691:14, 3691:17, & & & 3536:25 & 3653:5, 3653:17, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3691: 25,3693: 8 \\
& 3693: 10,3694: 17
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dam [1] - 3555:10 } \\
& \text { danger }[2]-3680:
\end{aligned}
\] & date [4] - 3547:2, REPORTING & \begin{tabular}{l}
declining [2]- \\
OUP :24, 3543:15
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3680: 7,3699: 9, \\
& 3721: 1,3721: 5
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}





\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3540: 4,3540: 23, \\
& 3541: 1.3541: 3 .
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3648: 21,3648: 23,
\]
3649:1, 3649:14, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3717: 9,3717: 13, \\
& 3719: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & 3577:21, 3580:9,
3586:8. 3597:19. & H \\
\hline 3541:5, 3541:12, & 3650:1, 3650:23, & getter [1] - 3601:9 & 04:3, 3604:15 & habitats [1]-3499:8 \\
\hline 3547:5, 3549:12, & 3651:7, 3654:9, & given [2] - 3535:17, & 3604:17, 3604:23, & half [8]-3574:20, \\
\hline 3549:15, 3553:10, & 3658:4, 3658:16, & 3715:1 & 3605:19, 3606:6, & 3592:4, 3592:6, \\
\hline 3553:23, 3554:1, & 3659:4, 3659:5, & goal [3] - 3612:10, & 3612:10 & 3624:25, 3626:7, \\
\hline 3555:11, 3555:13, & 3659:16, 3661:7, & 3612:12, 3652:13 & group [7] - 3577:23, & 3626:22, 3642:22, \\
\hline 3555:17, 3563:20, & 3661:8, 3662:1, & goals [1] - 3715:21 & 3582:5, 3585:15, & 3676:18 \\
\hline 3565:18, 3566:10, & 3662:13, 3662:19, & God [2] - 3495:1, & 3586:1, 3612:16, & hand [8] - 3494:22, \\
\hline 3567:9, 3568:11, & 3663:5, 3663:20, & 3570:23 & 3613:18, 3653:20 & 3527:18, 3550:17, \\
\hline 3570:16, 3571:6, & 3664:1, 3664:14, & golf [4] - 3519:9, & groups [3] - 3580:24, & 3570:19, 3623:10, \\
\hline 3571:7, 3572:22, & 3665:23, 3667:14, & 3521:18, 3523:2, & 3581:9, 3581:25 & 3623:18, 3655:6, \\
\hline 3572:25, 3573:19, & 3668:19, 3668:21, & 3525:24 & grow [4]-3542:8, & 3727:10 \\
\hline 3573:21, 3574:3, & 3670:1, 3670:8, & govern [1] - 3658:12 & 3690:15, 3691:1, & handed [1] - 3570:9 \\
\hline 3574:5, 3574:11, & 3673:25, 3675:1, & governing [3] - & 3691:3 & handful [1] - 3615:6 \\
\hline 3574:17, 3574:21, & 3676:8, 3676:14, & 3604:25, 3618:21, & growers [1] - 3689:10 & handwritten [1] - \\
\hline 3574:22, 3575:20, & 3676:25, 3678:9, & 3620:25 & growing [11] - 3566:6, & 3570:14 \\
\hline 3576:6, 3580:1, & 3678:14, 3679:15, & governme & 3675:2, 3675:12, & Hanner [1] - 3678:13 \\
\hline 3580:4, 3581:10, & 3681:1, 3681:25, & 3574:12 & 3691:7, 3691:12, & happy [3] - 3607:6, \\
\hline 3581:12, 3582:20, & 3682:2, 3682:4, & Governor & 3691:18, 3692:10, & 3607:10, 3725:22 \\
\hline 3582:23, 3582:24, & 3683:5, 3683:25, & 3524:11, 3524:15, & 3692:15, 3693:9, & hard [2] - 3691:5, \\
\hline 3583:7, 3583:15, & 3687:25, 3688:4, & \[
3524: 18,3649: 24
\] & 3694:10, 3694:17 & 3715:12 \\
\hline 3583:23, 3585:10, & 3688:18, 3689:6, & GPS [1] - 3700:10 & grown [6] - 3565:25, & hardware [6] - 3631:5, \\
\hline 3587:2, 3587:12, & 3689:8, 3689:24, & grandparents [1] - & 3566:4, 3566:6, & 3649:17, 3697:12, \\
\hline 3587:18, 3588:19, & 3690:22, 3690:25, & \[
3723: 20
\] & 3627:12, 3693:1, & 3697:19, 3708:25, \\
\hline 3588:23, 3589:1, & 3693:10, 3695:19, & grant [3]-3599: & 3693:24 & 3709:4 \\
\hline 3589:13, 3589:16, & 3696:6, 3697:18, & \[
3599: 8,3687: 2
\] & growth [9]-3502:13, & harmful [1] - 3697:3 \\
\hline 3589:20, 3589:23, & 3697:21, 3701:19, & grants & 3533:1, 3625:18, & harms [1] - 3601:24 \\
\hline 3590:3, 3590:5, & 3701:21, 3703:25, & \[
3664: 17
\] & 3632:10, 3654:19, & harvest [4]-3628:8, \\
\hline 3590:21, 3591:2, & 3706:18, 3707:23, & graph [6] - 3532:12, & 3657:9, 3691:24, & 3692:19, 3693:9, \\
\hline 3591:9, 3592:8, & 3708:12, 3711:5, & \[
3533: 21,3536: 6
\] & 3697:2, 3697:15 & 3694:21 \\
\hline 3592:12, 3593:7, & 3711:8, 3711:18, & \[
53: 8,
\] & guarantee [1] - & hazard [1] - 3616:19 \\
\hline 3593:14, 3593:21, & 3711:25, 3712:21, & 3719:22 & 3691:16 & head [3] - 3633:9, \\
\hline 3593:25, 3594:13, & 3712:23, 3713:1, & graphs [1] - 3553:7 & guess [2] - 3601:2, & 3641:3, 3673:8 \\
\hline 3595:24, 3596:4, & 3720:7, 3721:8, & gravity \({ }_{[1]}\) - 3544:16 & 3685:21 & heading [2] - 3618:13, \\
\hline 3596:12, 3596:16, & 3722:16, 3722:20 & gray [1] - 3588:5 & guidance [3] - 3510:7, & \[
3618: 19
\] \\
\hline 3596:18, 3597:8, & Georgia's [51] - & \[
\text { great }[4]-3500: 13
\] & 3510:13, 3510:25 & headings [1] - \\
\hline 3599:5, 3599:15, & 3496:12, 3497:6, & \[
3584: 9,3584: 15
\] & guided [1] - 3715:16 & 3632:24 \\
\hline 3603:16, 3603:21, & 3497:16, 3497:17, & 3626:12 & guidelines [1] - & heads [1] - 3673:18 \\
\hline 3605:12, 3607:6, & 3498:11, 3498:15, & greater [2] - 3685:10, & 3631:3 & headwaters [1] - \\
\hline 3611:24, 3612:4, & 3498:16, 3498:19, & 3685:20 & gun [11] - 3620:8, & 3581:5 \\
\hline 3612:7, 3614:17, & 3499:6, 3499:25, & greatly [2] - 3549:11, & 3620:11, 3620:13, & health [1] - 3619:11 \\
\hline 3615:2, 3615:3, & 3501:3, 3501:8, & \[
3552: 7
\] & 3622:14, 3622:16, & hear [2]-3615:22, \\
\hline 3615:9, 3615:16, & 3504:3, 3510:3, & green [6] - 3531:4, & 3622:19, 3649:17, & 3720:25 \\
\hline 3616:4, 3616:11, & 11:5, 3511:8, & 3563:12, 3563:16, & 3667:6, 3675:6, & heard [19]-3551:9, \\
\hline 3616:16, 3616:24, & 3535:4, 3540:15, & 3637:12, 3644:23, & 3675:13, 3709:13 & 3552:16, 3552:19, \\
\hline \[
3617: 2,3617: 6,
\] & \[
3541: 20,3541: 25,
\] & 3701:18 & guns [8]-3614:7, & 3569:7, 3573:18, \\
\hline 3617:7, 3622:9, & 3542:6, 3553:16, & ground [6] - 3631:18, & 3614:14, 3622:6 & 591:10, 3615:23, \\
\hline 3624:2, 3625:18, & 3555:2, 3556:15, & 3646:19, 3701:5, & 3622:8, 3622:10 & 615:25, 3616:10, \\
\hline 3625:23, 3626:1, & 3566:20, 3567:7, & 3708:15, 3708:19, & 22:13, 3675:1 & 617:12, 3617:15 \\
\hline 3626:15, 3626:17, & 3567:12, 3572:17, & 3710:14 & 3675:21 & \[
3627: 15,3629: 23
\] \\
\hline 3626:19, 3626:20, & 3573:5, 3573:8, & groundwater [14]- & guy [2]-3616:7, & 3630:2, 3648:14, \\
\hline 3626:22, 3628:2, & 3573:10, 3583:5, & 3528:19, 3554:5, & 3616 & 3648:16, 3681:19, \\
\hline 3628:6, 3628:7, & 3618:1, 3627:22, & 3554:10, 3638:22, & GWRI [5] - 3582:21, & 3716:15, 3723:24 \\
\hline \[
3638: 2,3639: 16
\] & 3639:8, 3646:24, & 3638:25, 3640:4, & 3583:1, 3583:4, & HEARING [1] - \\
\hline 3643:19, 3644:6, & \[
3651: 17,3655: 14,
\] & 3643:17, 3645:3, & \(3583: 7,3583: 12\)
GX-1247 [2] - \(3493: 17\) & 3492:10 \\
\hline 3644:8, 3645:4, & \[
3655: 16,3658: 10,
\] & 3645:8, 3646:13, & GX-1247 [2] - 3493:17, & hearing [3] - 3494:24, \\
\hline 3646:1, 3646:4, & 3658:25, 3679:19, & 3700:2, 3702:12, & GX-935 [2]-3493:17 & 3507:5, 3570:2 \\
\hline 3647:16, 3647:19, & \[
3679: 23,3683: 1^{\wedge}
\] & 3702:14, 3702:23 & GX-935 [2]-3493:17, & heat [1] - 3540:8 \\
\hline 3647:25, 3648:20, & 3683:25, 3716:1 & REPORTING & OUP :25 & heavily [2] - 3690:7, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}










\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3567:19, 3579:5, & 3609:14 & reasonable [17] - & 3714:13, 3714:17, & 3657:24, 3664:24 \\
\hline 3586:24, 3609:2, & read [31] - 3499:14, & 18, 3497:20, & 3715:1, 3715: & Referenced [1] - \\
\hline 3687:15, 3693:17, & 3586:19, 3586:23, & 3498:1, 3498:3, & recommended [2] - & 3493:7 \\
\hline 3706:23, 3716:2, & 3586:25, 3590:14, & 3498:7, 3498:15 & 3596:13, 3612:22 & referenced [5] - \\
\hline 3723:1 & \[
3591: 25,3592: 2,
\] & 3500:16, 3501:9, & recommending [1] - & 3510:25, 3523:19, \\
\hline quick [2] - 3538:16, & 3594:7, 3594:8, & 3502:18, 3502:20, & 3597:9 & 3623:15, 3658:18, \\
\hline 3671:12 & 3594:17, 3594:19, & 3502:25, 3503:11, & record [6]-3557:11, & 3658:20 \\
\hline quickly [1] - 3610:19 & 3597:5, 3597:7, & \[
3503: 12,3503: 24
\] & \[
3636: 12,3636: 14
\] & references [2] - \\
\hline ```
quite [2] - 3531:14,
    3547:2
``` & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3603: 10,3603: 13, \\
& 3608: 5,3608: 7,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3572: 13,3595: 19 \\
& 3630: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3647: 10,3716: 6 \\
& 3716: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3507: 16,3608: 19
\] \\
\hline quotation [1] - & 3611:3, 3611:7 & reasonableness [4] - & records [1] - 3639:16 & 3559:3, 3594:11, \\
\hline 3524:14 & 3611:8, 3619:5 & 3497:11, 3497:16, & recreate [1] - 3703:19 & 3595:12, 3677:9, \\
\hline quoting [1] - 3627: & 3619:25, 3621:4 & 3497:25, 3498:10 & RECROSS [2] - & 3683:21 \\
\hline & 3621:8, 3621:10, & reasons [3] - 3549:2 & 3557:2, 3716:13 & referred [4] - 3584:9, \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}\) & 3621:16, 3621:17, & 3549:7, 3597:2 & Recross [1] - 3493:2 & 3636:8, 3664:4, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \hline \text { rain [2] - 3540:17, } \\
& 3692: 7 \\
& \text { rainfall }[2]-3692: 21, \\
& 3695: 17 \\
& \text { rainstorm [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
\begin{gathered}
3665: 16,3671: 11 \\
\text { reading }[13]-3587: 6
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { receive }[4]-3574: 10 \\
& 3612: 17,3613: 19 \\
& 3691: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & RECROSSEXAMINATION [2] & \begin{tabular}{l}
3667:2 \\
referring [9] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & \[
3590: 12,3593: 7
\] & received [2] - 3599:11 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3557: 2,3716: 13 \\
& \text { red }[13]-3637: 3,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3594: 14,3622: 14 \\
& 3622: 15,3626: 13
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & 3593:11, 3600:5, & 3608:1 & \[
3637: 5,3644: 14
\] & 3643:4, 3643:10, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { rainstorm [1] - } \\
& 3540: 19
\end{aligned}
\] \\
raise [2] - 3494:21
\end{tabular}} & 3603:11, 3619:21, & receives [3]-3574:2, & \[
3644: 15,3644: 18
\] & 3643:13, 3679:7, \\
\hline & \[
3652: 15,3657: 13,
\] & \[
3574: 4,3574: 6
\] & \[
3644: 22,3644: 25,
\] & 3686:4 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { raise }[2]-3494: 21, \\
& 3570: 18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3667: 23,3668: 3
\] & receiving [5] - 3594:9, 3605:7, 3608:4 & \[
3645: 13,3701: 17
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { refers [2] - 3499:21, } \\
& 3551: 1
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { RALPH }{ }_{[1]}-3492: 11 \\
& \text { ramping [1] - 3514:24 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & readings [1] - 3686:12 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3605: 7,3608: 4 \\
& 3609: 12,3610: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3705: 23,3705: 24, \\
& 3706: 6,3711: 24
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3551: 1 \\
& \text { refine [1] - 3611:25 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline & ready [3] - 3494:13, & recent [5] - 3501:18, & redacted [1] - 3607:20 & refined [1] - 3610:8 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ramping-up [1] - } \\
& 3514: 24
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3494: 14,3687: 10
\] & \[
3530: 10,3533: 14
\] & Redirect [1] - 3493:2 & refinements [2] - \\
\hline random [1] - 3587:3 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { real [4] - 3538:16, } \\
3635: 9,3671: 11,
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
3566: 17,3622: 18 \\
\text { recently [10] - 3524:4, }
\end{gathered}
\] & redirect [3] - 3527:18, & \[
3611: 14,3611: 16
\] \\
\hline \[
\text { range }[4]-3599: 24,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3635: 9,3671: 11, \\
& 3680: 15
\end{aligned}
\] & recently [10] - 3524:4, & \begin{tabular}{l}
3687:4, 3721:21 \\
REDIRECT [3] -
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { reflect }[6]-3565: 1, \\
3627: 3,3632: 20,
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline 3614:8, 3633:17, & realize [3] - 3509:11, & \[
3565: 24,3565: 25,
\] & \[
3527: 21,3567: 21,
\] & 3633:1, 3641:8, \\
\hline 3710:11 & 3685:9, 3685:18 & 3566:5, 3566:7, & 3687:12 & 3657:2 \\
\hline ranges [1] - 3599:22 & realized [5]-3598:4, & \[
3566: 22,3566: 24,
\] & reduce [7] - 3512:17, & reflected [5] - 3556:6, \\
\hline rapidly [1] - 3537:1 & 3643:18, 3691:17, & 3649:25 & \[
3538: 15,3540: 12
\] & 3594:12, 3644:17, \\
\hline Rate [1] - 3669:6 & \[
3715: 11,3715: 17
\] & Recess [3] - 3570:4, & \[
3548: 7,3660: 18
\] & 3669:22, 3684:17 \\
\hline rate [15] - 3538:8, & really [33]-3509:14, & 3625:5, 3687:8 & 3667:24, 3709:7 & reflection [1] - \\
\hline 3631:6, 3632:2, & 3511:10, 3528:18, & recessed [1] - 3726:1 & reduced [5] - 3510:4, & 3646:24 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3632: 3,3632: 24 \\
& 3634: 13,3634: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & 3535:23, 3538:7, & recited [1] - 3542:14 & 3630:22, 3695:10, & reflective [4] - \\
\hline 3634:13, 3634:20, 3635:16, 3635:18 & 3540:13, 3541:12, & recognize [6] - & \[
3695: 12,3695: 17
\] & 3633:10, 3633:16, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3635: 16,3635: 18, \\
& 3655: 10,3666: 23,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3541: 18,3547: 22, \\
& 3548: 21,3548: 23,
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
3495:19, 3517:25, \\
3518.2 3571:15
\end{tabular} & reduces [3] - 3540:7, & 3637:6, 3649:16 \\
\hline 3667:1, 3684:19, & \[
3555: 12,3556: 21,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3518: 2,3571: 15 \\
& 3651: 10,3651: 23
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3553: 24,3631: 6
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { reflects }[3]-3517: 21, \\
3533: 17,3671: 15
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 3698:12 & 3562:9, 3568:9, & recognized [1] - & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { reducing [5] - 3535:6, } \\
3538: 25,3631: 13,
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
3533: 17,3671: 15 \\
\text { refused [1] - } 3717: 10
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline rates [5] - 3505:11, & 3568:13, 3598:9, & 3650:10 & 3680:17, 3680:19 & regard [1] - 3721:14 \\
\hline \[
3538: 11,3538: 12,
\] & \[
3635: 5,3643: 8
\] & recognizing [1] - & reduction [9] - & regarded [1] - 3542:19 \\
\hline 3710:1, 3710:15 & \[
3654: 21,3680: 4,
\] & 3665:19 & \[
3505: 14,3511: 1,
\] & regarding [16] - \\
\hline rather [8] - 3600:18, 3600:24 3602:1 & 3681:22, 3689:24, 3690:12, 3690:14 & recollection [2] - & 3517:20, 3565:16, & 3496:12, 3588:24, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3600: 24,3602: 1 \\
& 3631: 12,3644: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & 3690:18, 3691:5, & \[
3584: 18,3676: 21
\] & \[
3565: 19,3631: 10
\] & 3599:18, 3603:7, \\
\hline 3631:12, 3644:20,
\[
3684: 5,3686: 13
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3690: 18,3691: 5 \\
& 3695: 17,3704: 22
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
recommend [3] - \\
3597:13, 3612•17
\end{tabular} & \[
3657: 2,3668: 13
\] & \[
3603: 16,3607: 12
\] \\
\hline 3708:20 & \[
3706: 12,3712: 3,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3597: 13,3612: 17, \\
& 3613: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & 3707:11 & 3612:8, 3619:9, \\
\hline rational [1] - 3696:2 & \[
3715: 12
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 3613:19 } \\
& \text { recommendation [4] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & reductions [6] -
\[
3537: 21,3554: 4,
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3630: 13,3656: 16 \\
& 3679: 11,3683: 14
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\boldsymbol{\operatorname { R e }}[1]-3607: 17
\] & reason [14] - 3509:17, & \[
3596: 15,3606: 20,
\] & 3630:24, 3666:1, & \[
3714: 24,3716: 24
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { reach }[2]-3612: 10, \\
& 3612: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3569: 3,3640: 15 \\
& 3642: 17,3642: 25
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3714: 24,3715: 3
\] & \[
3666: 4,3680: 12
\] & \[
3718: 3,3719: 16
\] \\
\hline 3612:13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3642: 17,3642: 25 \\
& 3661: 17,3668: 12
\end{aligned}
\] & recommendations & refer [5] - 3496:21, & Regents [1] - 3574:8 \\
\hline reached [2] - 3611:13,
3612:16 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3661: 17,3668: 12 \\
& 3668: 15,3670: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & [13] - 3603:8, & \[
3496: 24,3544: 11,
\] & regime [2]-3631:11, \\
\hline 3612:16 & 3668:15, 3670:11, & \[
3612: 25,3613: 3
\] & \[
3544: 13,3630: 5
\] & 3695:22 \\
\hline reaching [1] - 3697:23 & 3674:23, 3708:13, & 3613:11, 3674:15, & reference [7] - 3507:6, & regimes [2] - 3587:20, \\
\hline reaction [1] - 3693:2 & 3718:15, 3719:11, & 3698:23, 3714:4, & & 3629:8 \\
\hline reactions [1] - & - & REPORTING & UUP :1, 3656:13, & region [10] - 3644:5, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}








\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3528:15, 3528:16, & 3596:1, 3596:7, & 3517:17, 3518:17, & whole [9] - 3494:25, & 3644:7, 3702:23, \\
\hline 3528:18, 3528:20, & 3601:5, 3601:10, & 3520:14, 3520:24, & 3539:11, 3539:14, & \[
3705: 20,3712: 25,
\] \\
\hline 3528:24, 3529:10, & 3612:18, 3612:22, & 3521:17, 3521:18, & 3561:18, 3570:22, & 3719:6 \\
\hline 3529:11, 3529:13, & 3613:7, 3613:10, & 3522:5, 3523:1, & 3615:12, 3621:4, & withdrawing [1] - \\
\hline 3529:16, 3530:1, & 3613:13, 3613:19, & 3525:12, 3525:23, & 3714:10, 3715:14 & 3696:19 \\
\hline 3530:9, 3530:10, & 3614:14, 3614:23, & 3525:25, 3527:7, & wide [3] - 3561:11, & withdrawn [3] - \\
\hline 3530:13, 3530:18, & 3615:4, 3615:7, & 3527:10, 3559:16, & 3561:12, 3694:6 & 3529:11, 3530:19, \\
\hline 3531:3, 3531:5, & 3615:8, 3619:3, & 3559:25, 3563:18, & widely [1] - 3585:5 & 3544:14 \\
\hline 3531:6, 3531:22, & 3619:9, 3619:15, & 3564:19, 3564:20, & widespread [1] - & withdraws [1] - \\
\hline 3532:5, 3533:5, & 3620:5, 3620:8, & 3615:19, 3616:15, & 3628:6 & 3567:9 \\
\hline 3534:20, 3535:5, & 3621:24, 3622:23, & 3617:6, 3618:6, & wildlife [2] - 3499:7, & Witness [1] - 3493:2 \\
\hline 3535:11, 3535:14, & 3624:4, 3629:8, & 3619:19, 3621:19, & 3722:21 & WITNESS [22] - \\
\hline 3535:15, 3535:16, & 3630:22, 3631:4, & 3624:2, 3632:2, & Wildlife [7] - 3584:19, & 3495:2, 3495:7, \\
\hline 3535:19, 3535:23, & 3631:13, 3639:17, & 3718:9 & 3584:22, 3602:18, & \[
3495: 16,3568: 21,
\] \\
\hline 3535:24, 3536:1, & 3640:3, 3644:6, & waters [1] - 3612:14 & \[
3602: 22,3603: 2,
\] & 3569:1, 3569:5, \\
\hline 3536:2, 3536:4, & 3652:9, 3652:22, & watershed [5] - & 3603:17, 3603:24 & 3569:13, 3569:20, \\
\hline 3536:7, 3536:9, & 3653:7, 3655:16, & 3669:17, 3669:23, & wind [4] - 3708:16, & 3570:24, 3571:4, \\
\hline 3536:18, 3537:9, & 3655:24, 3656:2, & 3673:10, 3673:11, & 3709:6, 3709:23 & 3723:6, 3723:9, \\
\hline 3537:22, 3538:1, & 3656:5, 3656:17, & 3707:10 & Wine [3] - 3571:25, & 3723:12, 3723:15, \\
\hline 3538:2, 3538:6, & 3657:2, 3657:8, & watersheds [1] - & \[
3572: 2,3716: 3
\] & 3723:18, 3723:21, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3538: 11,3538: 12 \\
& 3538: 13,3538: 15
\end{aligned}
\] & \(3658: 9,3658: 12\),
\(3658 \cdot 18,3658 \cdot 21\) & 3637:5 & wine [3] - 3622:24, & 3723:24, 3724:4, \\
\hline 3538:13, 3538:15, 3538.19, 3538.20 & \begin{tabular}{l}
3658:18, 3658:21, \\
3660:18, 3661:14
\end{tabular} & ways [3] - 3620:5, & 3704:18, 3714:14 & 3724:12, 3724:18, \\
\hline \[
3538: 25,3539: 5
\] & \[
3665: 22,3667: 4
\] & 3620:7, 3674:15
wealth [1] - 3649:1 & WINE [23] - 3492:17, & \[
3724: 24,3727: 10
\] \\
\hline \[
3540: 1,3540: 4,
\] & \[
3667: 14,3667: 24
\] & wealth [1] - \(3649: 19\)
weather [4]-3691:4 & 3571:23, 3572:3, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { witness }[7]-3495: 12, \\
3495: 25,3496: 8,
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline 3540:6, 3540:11, & 3668:5, 3668:14, & 3691:5, 3691:7, & \[
3578: 5,3578: 10
\] & \[
3571: 10,3571: 21
\] \\
\hline 3540:12, 3540:21, & 3671:7, 3671:17, & 3691:11 & 3582:7, 3582:15, & 3572:22, 3725:1 \\
\hline \[
3540: 24,3541: 4,
\] & \[
3674: 13,3675: 2,
\] & website [1] - 3725:16 & 3618:15, 3618:16, & witnesses [1] - \\
\hline 3541:6, 3541:8, & \begin{tabular}{l}
3679:11, 3679:19, \\
3680:5, 3680:10
\end{tabular} & weeds [1] - 3630:19 & \[
3621: 13,3621: 15
\] & 3550:18 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
3541:11, 3541:14, \\
3541.19, 3541.21
\end{tabular} & 3680:5, 3680:10, & week [11] - 3520:25, & 3624:13, 3624:21, & wondering [2] - \\
\hline \[
3541: 24,3542: 4
\] & 3680:13, 3680:18,
\[
3680: 19,3681: 3
\] & 3521:17, 3524:12, & 3625:1, 3625:7, & 3596:4, 3651:10 \\
\hline 3544:7, & 3680.19, 3681.3 & 3524:20, 3525:9, & 3625:14, 3647:10, & Woodruff [1] - \\
\hline \[
3544: 17,3545: 2
\] & 3682:22, 3682:24 & 3526:7, 3526:9, & \[
3647: 12,3716: 4
\] & 3555:10 \\
\hline 3546:17, 3547:3, & 3683:4, 3684:6, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3526: 19,3527: 8, \\
& 3659 \cdot 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
3716: 14,3724: 21
\] & Woody [3] - 3585:9, \\
\hline 3548:12, 3548:21, & 3686:6, 3686:14, & 3659:9
weeks [2] - 3620:20, & \begin{tabular}{l}
WINN [1] - 3492:21 \\
winning [2] - 3540:
\end{tabular} & word [6] - 3494:7, \\
\hline 3548:22, 3548:23, & 3688:5, 3688:14, & 3623:6 & 3540:15 & \[
3518: 25,3520: 10,
\] \\
\hline 3548:24, 3548:25, & 3688:17, 3689:4, & welfare [1] - 3619:12 & wish [1] - 3725:21 & \[
3520: 15,3554: 14
\] \\
\hline \(3549: 1, ~ 3549: 4\),
\(3549: 5,3549: 7\) & 3689:10, 3692:11, & well-respected [2] - & withdraw [1] - & 3634:18 \\
\hline \(3549: 5,3549: 7\),
\(3549 \cdot 9,3549: 10\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
3692:17, 3693:13, \\
3696.7 3696.11
\end{tabular} & 3616:3, 3616:7 & 3696:17 & words [4] - 3501:1, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3549: 9,3549: 10 \\
& 3549: 12,3549: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & 3696:7, 3696:11,
\[
3696: 17.3696: 1!
\] & wells [1] - 3696:16 & Withdrawal [1] - & 3601:4, 3697:23, \\
\hline \[
3549: 23,3550: 2
\] & 3697:1, 3697:5, & West [3] - 3581:6, & 3655:3 & 3708:16 \\
\hline 3550:6, 3550:12, & 3697:9, 3698:5, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
3581: 8,3714: 21 \\
\text { wet }[5]-3561: 8,
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
\] & withdrawal [11] -
\[
3541: 17,3575: 11
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { works [2] - } 3496: 25 \text {, } \\
& 3552: 5
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 3550:13, 3551:3, & 3698:10, 3698:13, & \[
3590: 1,3633: 17
\] & \[
3575: 12,3588: 1,
\] & world [4] - 3635:9, \\
\hline \[
3554: 23,3555: 12
\] & 3699:3, 3699:4, & \[
3662: 24,3695: 18
\] & 3655:6, 3655:16, & \[
3690: 9,3690: 14,
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
3555:18, 3555:20, \\
3555:24, 3559:8,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3699: 7,3700: 1 \\
& 3700: 3,3700: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & wetted [16]-3645:17, & 3655:20, 3656:2, & 3690:19 \\
\hline \[
3560: 1,3560: 4
\] & 3701:20, 3702:6, & 3646:4, 3646:15, & 3656:5, 3700:3, & worse [1] - 3601:9 \\
\hline 3560:12, 3560:13, & 3702:10, 3702:15, & 3646:17, 3646:22, & 3702:20 & writing [1] - 3570:11 \\
\hline \[
3563: 21,3563: 24,
\] & \[
3708: 15,3708: 17,
\] & 3647:1, 3647:3, & withdrawals [26] - & written [4] - 3495:20, \\
\hline & \[
3708: 19,3708: 24
\] & 647:7, 3647:20, & 3505:11, 3505:22, & 3587:5, 3587:15, \\
\hline \[
3564: 21,3565: 15,
\] & 3709:2, 3709:6, & \(3647: 24,3649: 5\),
\(3649: 16,3650: 1\) & 3506:7, 3506:22, & 3587:21 \\
\hline 3566:21, 3567:7, & 3709:16, 3709:20, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3649: 16,3650: 1 \\
& 3700: 12,3719: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3530: 25,3542: 15 \\
& 3543: 9,3554: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & wrote [2] - 3501:22, \\
\hline 3567:9, 3567:12, & 3709:22, 3714:18, & 3719:16 & 3554:11, 3563:10, & 3542:5 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3567: 24,3568: 2, \\
& 3568: 5,3568: 7,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3714: 19,3715: 2, \\
& 3720: 20,3721: 2,
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
wetting [1] - 3620:13 \\
whereas [4]-3619:1
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
3563:13, 3588:14, \\
3589:25, 3592:24,
\end{tabular} & X \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3568: 22,3573: 11, \\
& 3575: 2,3576: 6 \\
& 3579: 24,3587: 14 \\
& 3587: 25,3589: 18
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
3721: 5,3721: 9, \\
3721: 10,3721: 15 \\
3721: 16,3721: 1^{7} \\
\text { watering }[28]-35
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
3619: 5,3684: 16
\] \\
WHEREOF [1] - \\
REPORTING
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3638: 21,3638: 23 \\
& 3638: 25,3639: 17 \\
& \text { OUP }: 4,3644: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { XIV }{ }_{[1]}-3492: 5 \\
& \text { XV }{ }_{[1]}-3618: 14
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

