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| 1 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, we're still | 1 | page. |
| 2 | under tab 5. The next set of questions | 2 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 3 | relates to a section called Statistical | 3 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, please turn to |
| 4 | Catch-At-Age Model on page 14 of this | 4 | tab 8 of the binder, which is Florida's |
| 5 | document. And on page 14 we'll be looking | 5 | complaint in this matter. And the next part |
| 6 | specifically at the last sentence of the | 6 | of the discussion will relate to paragraph 54 |
| 7 | first full paragraph on that page, which is | 7 | of the complaint, which is at the top of |
| 8 | highlighted in your binder. | 8 | page 19. And we have marked this page with |
| 9 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 9 | another blue flag in your binder. |
| 10 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, if you would | 10 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 11 | just turn to the next page of the same | 11 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, please turn to |
| 12 | document, page 15, Dr. Pine will now answer | 12 | tab 9 of the binder, which is marked as Joint |
| 13 | questions about the left-hand column of the | 13 | Exhibit 167. Dr. Pine will first answer some |
| 14 | page under the title Restoration Actions, | 14 | general questions about this paper. And |
| 15 | Caution, and Future Work. | 15 | then, again, there are no page numbers; but |
| 16 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 16 | he will also answer questions related to the |
| 17 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, the last set of | 17 | fourth page of the document, which we have |
| 18 | questions on this document relates to page 29 | 18 | marked with a blue flag. |
| 19 | of the document under a section titled | 19 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 20 | Research. | 20 | MS. MERKI: And, your Honor, again, |
| 21 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 21 | there are no page numbers for this document; |
| 22 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, we're now moving | 22 | but if you would please turn to the next blue |
| 23 | on to tab 6 of the binder, which is marked as | 23 | flag in the binder, the discussion will |
| 24 | Joint Exhibit 91. And this document is the | 24 | relate to the highlighted portion of that |
| 25 | Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | page. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
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| 1 | Commission Oyster Disaster Report dated May | 1 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 2 | 2013 which was submitted to NOAA as part of | 2 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, we'll turn now |
| 3 | the disaster request, and if you would please | 3 | to tab 10 of the binder, which is Georgia |
| 4 | turn to the blue flag on page 5 of the | 4 | Exhibit 1148. And this is an unpublished |
| 5 | document. | 5 | manuscript titled A Complex Relationship |
| 6 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 6 | Between Freshwater Discharge and Oyster |
| 7 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, we're still | 7 | Fisheries CPUE in Apalachicola Bay, Florida, |
| 8 | under tab 6, but we'll be turning the page to | 8 | authored by Dr. Pine and Nicholas Fisch. And |
| 9 | page 6 of this document. And the next clip | 9 | this paper is currently under review for |
| 10 | relates to the highlighted portion of this | 10 | publication in the Marine and Coastal |
| 11 | page. | 11 | sheries Journal. |
| 12 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 12 | Dr. Pine will answer some general |
| 13 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, the next | 13 | uestions about the paper and then will |
| 14 | discussion relates to tab 7 of your binder, | 14 | answer questions related to the second page |
| 15 | which is marked as Georgia Exhibit 789. | 15 | of the document. And we have highlighted the |
| 16 | Dr. Pine will first answer some general | 16 | relevant portions. |
| 17 | questions about this paper. | 17 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 18 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 18 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, please turn now |
| 19 | MS. MERKI: Your Honor, this document | 19 | tab 11 of the binder, Georgia Exhibit 778, |
| 20 | does not have page numbers, but the next part | 20 | which is an e-mail sent from Dr. Pine to |
| 21 | of the discussion relates to the blue tab | 21 | ree of his colleagues. Dr. Pine will |
| 22 | that we have put in your binder under a | 22 | nswer a series of questions about several |
| 23 | section titled Discussions. And the | 23 | statements in this e-mail, starting with the |
| 24 | questions relate specifically to the second | 24 | first sentence of the e-mail. |
| 25 | full paragraph on the second column of this | 25 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
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|  | page. | 1 | were just played. In particular, page 171, |
| 2 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 2 | line 17 through 173 -- excuse me, 172, 16 was |
| 3 | MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, we'll now -- | 3 | actually designated by Georgia; and then the |
| 4 | we'll next move to tab 15 of the binder, | 4 | remainder of that clip in red was Florida's |
| 5 | which is a familiar document to the Court. | 5 | counter-designation. So I didn't want you to |
| 6 | It is GX-568, the 2013 University of Florida | 6 | have the impression that Florida had |
| 7 | Apalachicola Bay Oyster Situation Report. | 7 | designated that entire portion. |
| 8 | The first series of clips discusses the | 8 | So - |
| 9 | report in general. | 9 | MR. PERRY: Your Honor, might we suggest |
| 10 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 10 | that a break would be appropriate given that |
| 11 | MR. MAHONEY: Staying with the same | 11 | it's about 10:30? |
| 12 | document, your Honor, if you will turn to the | 12 | I don't mean to interrupt counsel for |
| 13 | first blue tab. It's on page 13. And the | 13 | Georgia, but I also want to be cognizant that |
| 14 | discussion here pertains to the penultimate | 14 | we have been sitting here for a couple of |
| 15 | sentence in that paragraph on the left column | 15 | hours. |
| 16 | of page 13. | 16 | SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Sure. We'll |
| 17 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 17 | take a brief break. |
| 18 | MR. MAHONEY: If you will turn one page | 18 | (Time Noted: 10:35 a.m.) |
| 19 | further into the document now, on page 15 the | 19 | (Recess Called) |
| 20 | discussion continues. And it focuses on the | 20 | (Time Noted: 10:47 a.m.) |
| 21 | section that begins, restoration actions. | 21 | MR. MAHONEY: Thank you, your Honor. |
| 22 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 22 | We will continue now with the video |
| 23 | MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, the last | 23 | designations of Dr. Havens. |
| 24 | series of clips related to this document is | 24 | The next set of clips pertains to tab 8 |
| 25 | on page 29, which we have marked with the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | 25 | in the binder. And the exhibit number is THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart |
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| 1 | blue tab. And it's under the second bullet | 1 | GX-752. And it is an e-mail exchange among |
| 2 | of the section called Research. | 2 | Dr. Havens and his colleagues. And you will |
| 3 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 3 | see the highlighted text in the document. |
| 4 | MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, if you will | 4 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 5 | please turn to page -- or to -- excuse me, if | 5 | MR. MAHONEY: Next, we'll look at tab 9 |
| 6 | you will turn to tab 6 in the binder for the | 6 | of the binder. The exhibit number is GX-799. |
| 7 | next series of clips. It relates to GX-649, | 7 | This is an e-mail from Dr. Havens to a NOAA |
| 8 | and in particular, at the bottom of the | 8 | official in 2015. |
| 9 | second page of the e-mail correspondence | 9 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 10 | between Dr. Havens and a man named John | 10 | MR. MAHONEY: The next document that the |
| 11 | Cirino, along with several other individuals | 11 | video clips will be discussing is in tab 10 |
| 12 | being copied. | 12 | of the binder. And it's Exhibit No. GX-1340. |
| 13 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 13 | This is an e-mail from Dr. Havens to several |
| 14 | MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, the next | 14 | individuals, fall 2014. And they will be -- |
| 15 | series of clips is in tab 7 of your binder. | 15 | the video will be in reference to the fourth |
| 16 | And it's GX-741 is the document. The | 16 | paragraph of that e-mail. |
| 17 | discussion in the video focuses on page 4, | 17 | (Whereupon the video was played.) |
| 18 | which we have marked with a blue tab. And we | 18 | MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, the last |
| 19 | have also highlighted the text that is being | 19 | series of Georgia's clips are -- or discuss |
| 20 | discussed. | 20 | the document that's in tab 11 of the binder, |
| 21 | (Whereupon the video was played.) | 21 | which we have already seen earlier this |
| 22 | MR. MAHONEY: Your Honor, before we move | 22 | morning. It's JX-167 written by Edward Camp |
| 23 | on, I just want to note for the record that | 23 | and colleagues. It's a journal article |
| 24 | there appears to be a mix-up in what was | 24 | called Collapse of a Historic Oyster Fishery: |
| 25 | designated by each party for the clips that | 25 | Diagnosing Causes and Identifying Paths |
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| A. I had -- I had not scanned this in-depth until we had my deposition. And that's where we discussed this. <br> Q. So the answer to my question is, yes, when you submitted your direct testimony to this Court, you were aware of this excerpt? <br> A. I would say that, no, when I submitted my original expert report, I hadn't looked at this in-depth. <br> Q. Actually, Dr. Lipcius, I want to pause you because I think we're talking past each other. <br> A. Okay. <br> Q. The expert report that you submitted earlier in the summer in May, that's separate from your direct testimony -- <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. -- that Georgia counsel handed you. <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. That direct testimony was submitted on October 26. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. So my question, again, is when you submitted your direct testimony to this Court, you knew about the excerpt that I just read? <br> A. Yes, of course. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | predation caused the collapse, you didn't read the transcript; and you didn't watch the video. <br> Correct? <br> A. Not the two that you're speaking about, but I did read this. Yes. <br> Q. Okay. Well, let's look at portions of the transcript from Mr. Berrigan's presentation to the Apalachicola Bay community behind tab 5. <br> A. Right. <br> May I add some context to the statement made by Mr. Berrigan here? <br> Q. Dr. Lipcius, when you submitted your direct testimony, that was your opportunity to provide context. After I finish, counsel for Georgia will question you -- <br> A. Okay. <br> Q. -- on redirect; and you will, again, have an opportunity to provide context. <br> A. Thank you. <br> Q. But right now, I need you to answer my questions. <br> Behind tab 5, sir, there's a transcript of Mr. Berrigan's presentation to Apalachicola Bay. That's designated as FX-875. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Sir, I'll ask you to refer to page 2 and read the THE REPORTING GROUP |
| Q. And you also knew that Mr. Berrigan had spoken publicly about the oyster collapse when it occurred? <br> A. I was aware that he had spoken publicly, yes. <br> Q. In fact, he had made a presentation to the community of Apalachicola Bay as well as the Board of County Commissioners in September 2012. Right? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Okay. And that presentation was videotaped, and a copy of that video was provided to Georgia in this litigation. Right? <br> A. I assume so. <br> Q. You don't cite to that video in your expert report; do you? <br> A. I don't believe so. <br> Q. And you don't cite to it in your direct testimony; do you? <br> A. No, I don't. <br> Q. Have you watched the video in its entirety, sir? <br> A. No, I have not. <br> Q. Have you read the transcript? <br> A. No, I have not. <br> Q. Okay. So before you submitted to this Court your statements that there is no evidence that THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | last paragraph that begins, the bay thrives on fresh water. <br> A. I'm sorry. You said -- <br> Q. I'm sorry. I gave you the wrong page. <br> If you go to page 2 and read the last paragraph starting with, going into the western portion of the Apalachicola Bay, and read the entirety of that paragraph on this page. <br> A. I have read it. <br> Q. And, sir, can I request that you look to page 3 and read the paragraph at the bottom that begins, this bay thrives on fresh water. <br> A. I have read it. <br> Q. Okay. Did you see the portion that states -where Mr. Berrigan states, predation is unbelievable. Do you see that? <br> A. I did. <br> Q. Sir, do you know who Mr. Tommy Ward is? <br> A. I do. <br> Q. Who is he? <br> A. He is an oysterman and a seafood processor. <br> Q. Okay. You never mention him in your direct testimony. Correct? <br> A. I don't believe so. <br> Q. Okay. And you never mention him in your expert THE REPORTING GROUP |
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| 1 Summary Judgment on Phase 2 Claims filed in <br> 2 the Tri-State water rights litigation case in <br> 3 the Middle District of Florida. It has ECF <br> 4 Docket No. 309 in the Tri-States water litigation. It was also behind tab 7 in Dr. Allan's cross document binder. <br> The next document is GX-1275. It is behind tab 10 in the Hoehn cross-examination binder. It is titled Factual Appendix in Support of the State of Florida and City of Apalachicola's Joint Motion For Summary Judgment on Phase 2 Claims. This document was also filed in the Tri-State water rights litigation case before the Middle District of Florida and bears ECF Docket No. 310. <br> So the next document is GX-1276. It was behind tab 11 in the Hoehn cross-examination binder. It is the Declaration of Douglas E. Barr in the Tri-State water rights litigation case in the Middle District of Florida and has ECF Docket No. 311-4 and was filed on December 9, 2009, in that case. <br> The next document is GX-1281. It is the Supplemental Declaration of Theodore S. Hoehn Supporting Florida's Motion For Preliminary THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | GX-1284. It was behind tab 11 in the <br> cross-examination binder used with Dr. Allan. It is the November 11, 2008, letter from Mike Sole, to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps. It bears Bates No. FL-ACF-02427204 through 206. <br> The next set of documents I want to identify for the record are deposition excerpts that reflect impeachment material that was used in court but was played by video and, therefore, was not transcribed on the record. We also have created exhibits for deposition testimony that were submitted by video and will provide an exhibit number for those as well. <br> We have highlighted in yellow the actual specific questions and answers that were used as impeachment and will provide that to the Court as part of the exhibit set. <br> The first is Exhibit GX-1345. It's the impeachment material for Dr. Allan and contains excerpts from the June 2 and June 3, 2016, deposition transcript of Dr. Allan that were used as impeachment during his examination. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
| Injunction on Endangered Species Act Claims filed in the case captioned State of Alabama and State of Florida versus United States Army Corps of Engineers in the Northern District of Alabama. The document was filed in that court on April 10, 2006, and has ECF Docket No. 437 in that case. <br> The next document is GX-1282. This document is titled Joint Agreement Extending Time to Agree Upon an Equitable Apportionment of the Surface Waters of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River Basin. It was provided to Mr. Struhs during his cross-examination. <br> The next document is GX-1283. It was behind tab 4 in the cross-examination binder used with Dr. Allan. It is titled Complaint For Declaratory and Injunctive Relief in the State of Florida versus United States Fish and Wildlife Service, case No. 06-CV-410 in the Northern District of Florida. The document was filed in that court on September 6, 2006. <br> The last document from the first two days of trial that we want to mark is THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart | GX-1346 contains excerpts from the <br> February 24, 2016, deposition transcript of Rob Beaton, B E A T O N, that were used as impeachment during his examination. <br> Exhibit GX-1347 is the impeachment from Dr. Glibert. This contains excerpts from the June 1 and June 2, 2016, deposition transcript of Patricia Glibert that were used as impeachment during her examination. <br> GX-1348 is the Greenblatt impeachment and contains the excerpts from the May 19, 2016, deposition transcript of Marcia Greenblatt that were used as impeachment during her examination in court. <br> Exhibit GX-1349 contains the excerpts of the December 1, 2015, deposition transcript of Karl Havens that were played in court on December 1. <br> GX-1350 is the Hoehn impeachment and contains the excerpts from the February 18, 2016, deposition transcript of Theodore Hoehn that were used as impeachment during his examination in court. <br> GX-1351 is the Hornberger impeachment. <br> This exhibit contains excerpts from the THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
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| A. Sir, I would like to, if we can, refer to my statement because I believe I said abnormal mortality. <br> Q. Why don't you look at the table of contents. <br> A. I'm sorry? <br> Q. Look at the table of contents -- <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. -- of your direct testimony. <br> A. Oh, sure. <br> Q. Roman numeral IID that begins on page 19, no evidence of increased mortality due to predation. Did I read that correctly, sir? <br> A. Okay. Yes. <br> Q. I did read it correctly? <br> A. You did read it correctly. Yes. <br> Q. Okay. Let's now go to tab 8. Tab 8 is an e-mail that you cite portions of in your direct testimony. It's designated as GX-486. And it's an e-mail exchange with Dr. David Kimbro and Dr. Bill Pine. <br> You're familiar with these individuals; right, sir? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. I would like to turn you to the e-mail on the second page from Dr. Kimbro to Dr. Pine that's THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | section I want you to focus on is where <br> Dr. Havens says, here is what I think the answer is. And, Bill, you can correct if this is wrong. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Sir, you cite to Dr. Havens's deposition testimony; but you don't cite to this particular e-mail. Were you aware of it? <br> A. I'm not sure. <br> Q. Sir, you're based in the Virginia area and do a lot of work in Chesapeake Bay; is that right? <br> A. I do. <br> Q. Okay. I want to switch topics a little bit and talk a little bit about that work in connection with your opinion that all scientific evidence proves that low river flow from the Apalachicola River did not cause the oyster collapse in the bay. In connection with that opinion, you write in paragraph 30 on page 8 of your direct testimony that there's no instance in the scientific literature of drought-induced high salinity in an estuary having caused a population-wide collapse of an entire eastern oyster fishery. <br> A. I'm sorry. Could you refer me to a paragraph? <br> Q. Sure. Paragraph 30. <br> THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart |
| dated Thursday, October 25, 2012, at 10:02 p.m. <br> It's a relatively short e-mail, so I would ask you to read it to yourself, sir. <br> A. Okay. <br> Q. Sir, when you write in your direct testimony that there was no evidence of increased mortality due to predation, you were familiar with Dr. Kimbro's observations about the subtidal and intertidal reefs being infested with a carnivorous snail? <br> A. Yes, I was aware he made that statement. <br> Q. Okay. Sir, now, I'm going to ask you to look at an e-mail on your screen in front of you. <br> Everyone else will have this in a binder, because it was passed out this morning. It was the Havens binder. And tab 4 in the Havens binder -- we'll put it up on the screen -- it's GX-1339. <br> MR. QURESHI: And the version that will be in everyone's binder will have particular language from Dr. Havens highlighted in yellow, but not all of it. <br> BY MR. QURESHI: <br> Q. And I would like to ask you to read to yourself the language that's not highlighted in yellow. So if you could scroll up a little bit, and the THE REPORTING GROUP <br> Mason \& Lockhart | A. 30. <br> Q. Page 8 . <br> A. Okay. <br> Q. Okay. And in connection with your work on the Chesapeake Bay, have you come across the article that's behind tab 9 and marked FX-949? <br> The title of this article is Unusual Intensification of Chesapeake Bay Oyster Disease During Recent Drought Conditions. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Can you take a moment to read the abstract to yourself. <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Okay. Sir, you were familiar with this article when you submitted your direct testimony, sir? <br> A. I was familiar with the work and probably came across the article as well, $I$ believe. <br> Q. We talked about Dr. Petes earlier today. And I said we would come back to her, and now is the right time. Do you know Dr. Petes? <br> A. Not personally, no. <br> Q. Okay. You're aware that she works at the -- or she did work at the NOAA climate program office? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Okay. Do you know what she's doing currently? THE REPORTING GROUP |




Q. And does that include mari
A. Yes.
Q. Could you explain to the Court, please, what
marine ecology is.
A. So marine ecology deals with -- in marine systems, the relationships between the environment and species. That's in the broadest sense.

And in the broadest sense, the environment means all elements of the environment, whether it includes anthropogenic, human cause factors, or natural factors.
Q. And what types of species would be included in the category of marine ecology that you specialize?
A. The species would include things like crabs, lobsters, marine fish, oysters, clams, queen conch, and the like.
Q. And, sir, are you also a professor in fisheries management?
A. I'm formerly a professor in marine science; but one of $\mathbf{m y}$ specializations is fishery management.
Q. And would you please explain to the Court what

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
fishery management is.
A. So fishery management is simply the management of exploited or harvested species, how to manage them. Generally you want to manage them so that they're sustainably harvested over the long term.
Q. And would that also include management of an oyster fishery?
A. Of course.
Q. Now you, sir, have done work related to the Chesapeake Bay; is that correct?
A. Extensively, yes.
Q. And is it the case that the Chesapeake Bay oyster fishery experienced a collapse?
A. Yes. It has.
Q. Would you please describe for the Court what your involvement has been with respect to the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay oyster fishery.
A. Well, as the Court may not know, the Chesapeake Bay oyster fishery basically collapsed in the early to mid-1900's. It is now at about 1 percent of its historical abundance. And there are major efforts underway to restore the eastern oyster population, the native oyster in the Chesapeake Bay.

In fact, President Obama signed an Executive THE REPORTING GROUP
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Order to restore 20 tributaries -- restore the eastern oyster in $\mathbf{2 0}$ tributaries in the bay by 2020.

We have made some great strides in that regard. My role has been to conduct scientific studies to support the restoration effort as well as to advise federal, state, and nongovernmental agencies such as the Nature Conservancy on restoration efforts.
Q. And how has that restoration effort been proceeding?
A. We are now at a point where we feel that we're on the cusp of restoring the Chesapeake Bay's oyster population. In one of the tributaries -it's called the Great Wicomico River -- we initiated -- we, I mean federal agencies, state, and the like, initiated a restoration effort that led to the most successful oyster -- native oyster restoration anywhere in the world. We were able to restore $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ million -- a population of about $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ million oysters by a major restoration effort, meaning reshell, shelling the prime oyster bars in good locations. And that -- and I have been monitoring that effort since 2006. And it remains as a successful THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
restoration effort except for in a couple places where the oyster reefs have been poached. But, otherwise, it remains as really the gold standard in my view of oyster restoration.
Q. And overall, sir, how long have you personally been studying and working with respect to issues related to the eastern oyster?
A. I actually initiated that when I was at Florida State University pursuing my Ph.D. and off and on, but since 2004 that's been a major focus of my research.
Q. And you received your Ph.D. in what year?
A. 1984.
Q. I'm sorry. So this is over three decades now?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's turn to the conclusion that you were asked about. And as a -- you have in your written direct testimony that low flows did not cause the 2012 Apalachicola Bay oyster collapse. Now, sir, did low flows cause the collapse?
A. No. Most definitely not.
Q. I would like to walk briefly through a couple of the analyses that you did to explain to the Court how you reached that determination. And if I could refer in your written direct, please -- and THE REPORTING GROUP
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the Court -- to page 12 of the written direct testimony. And there is a demonstrative number 3 there.

And, now, you were here when Dr. White, the expert for the State of Florida, testified; were you not?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And so you probably recall that I put this up on the screen and asked him some questions about it. Does this reflect one of the analyses you did to reach the conclusion that low flows did not cause the collapse of the oyster fishery?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Would you please explain to the Court what is the analysis that you conducted underlying this demonstrative and how it supports your conclusion.
A. Certainly. So the approach I took was a basic scientific method, which is that you pose alternative hypotheses. It's not unlike the causal analysis that was referred to earlier by Dr. Menzie. Effectively what you do is you set up multiple working hypotheses, positions about the cause. And then from each of those, predictions stem. And you assess whether or not THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
4382
the available evidence, the data, supports them.
And it allows you then to go one by one to the different hypotheses, whether it's low flow, predation, overharvest, and so on.

And so one of the key predictions from the hypothesis that low flow and high salinity caused high predation or triggered high predation and/or disease is that you would have a bay-wide decline. And so what I did is I looked at the fishery-independent data provided by FDACS to the State of Florida's main survey agency. And I looked at the bars that were heavily fished. And those are indicated in red in this particular graph. And I looked at the bars that were lightly fished or were -- had been reshelled. And I looked at two periods. I looked at the time period from 2008 through 2012 as prior to the collapse, and the time period from October 2012 to August 2014 as the period after the collapse.

And what I would have expected to see across these nine bars is I would have expected to see the same pattern; that is, a major decline in abundance of oysters on all the oyster bars.

As an aside, I need to add that these were THE REPORTING GROUP
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not arbitrarily selected. I selected the bars that had the data available to perform an analysis on the heavily-fished and on the lightly-fished bars. And that's why the time periods were selected and why those bars were selected.

As you can see, for each of the graphs that you see there, either in red or blue, the bar on the left is what was the oyster abundance on the bar prior to the collapse. And the bar on the right is what was there after the collapse.
Q. I just want to make sure that we keep the Court with us here. So is it correct then what you were referring to here is we have East Hole, for instance, which is in red. And that's one of the more commercially-harvested bars; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so then this bar on the left-hand side that says pre, this is a measure of the abundance before the collapse took place?
A. Correct.
Q. And then the smaller bar shows that there were fewer oysters after the collapse; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Then, similarly, we have got another oyster bar

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
not arbitrarily selected. I selected the bars
that had the data available to perform an
analysis on the heavily-fished and on the
lightly-fished bars. And that's why the time
periods were selected and why those bars were
selected.
here, Hotel, in blue, which is relatively close to East Hole. And this is one of the, you said, lightly harvested or reshelled bars?
A. Yes.
Q. And then if you just explain to the Court then why is there -- what the contrast is here with the pre and the post, how that relates to your conclusion.
A. Okay. So as I said, what I expected to see, had there been a bay-wide collapse due to low river flow and high salinity and predation, all those bars should have looked like the red bars; but they didn't. The five that were lightly fished or reshelled didn't show that. In fact, some of them actually increased in abundance.

So this is the legal-size oysters. I saw exactly the same pattern for sub-legal-size oysters.

And one of the interesting points about this, a point that was raised by Dr. White and Dr. Kimbro, they felt that there may be a confounding factor; that is, that maybe there were different environmental conditions at the red bars than the blue bars, and in particular, salinity. And that's not the case. I did the THE REPORTING GROUP
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|  | 4385 |  | 4387 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | statistical analyses of it, and there is no | 1 | landings until about two years later. |
| 2 | relationship between salinity and the change in | 2 | So what $I$ did is $I$ conducted a number of |
| 3 | abundance. | 3 | different analyses, different time lags, |
| 4 | And, in fact, Hotel Bar has probably the | 4 | different time periods of flow. And they all -- |
| 5 | highest salinity of any of the bars there. And | 5 | all came up with the same result, whether it's |
| 6 | Hotel Bar is the one on the lower right; it's one | 6 | average annual flow or any of the other |
| 7 | of the blue ones. And as you can see, that | 7 | variables, that there is absolutely no |
| 8 | actually showed an increase in abundance. | 8 | statistical relationship between river flow and |
| 9 | So, to me, this was fully inconsistent with | 9 | landings. |
| 10 | the position that low river flow, high salinity, | 10 | And I did this because Dr. Pine had conducted |
| 11 | and predation or disease caused bay-wide decline, | 11 | a similar analysis; and I wanted to validate for |
| 12 | bay-wide collapse of the oyster population. This | 12 | myself with the data that there was no |
| 13 | data alone allows me to reject that absolutely. | 13 | relationship -- no relationship between landings |
| 14 | Q. And, Professor, is this data that you used for | 14 | and river flow. |
| 15 | that analysis fishery-dependent or | 15 | Q. Now, Professor Lipcius, this covers the entire |
| 16 | fishery-independent data? | 16 | period from 1986 through 2014. But even if you |
| 17 | A. This is fishery-independent data. So this is | 17 | were to look only at, say, 2002 to 2014, would it |
| 18 | data collected by Mr. Berrigan and the staff at | 18 | still be your conclusion that there is not a |
| 19 | FDACS. | 19 | correlation relationship between the river flow |
| 20 | Q. I would like to turn to another analysis that you | 20 | and landings? |
| 21 | did that relied on fishery-dependent data. If I | 21 | A. There would be, because the data were so |
| 22 | could refer you and the Court, please, in your | 22 | uncorrelated that it pertains to the full time |
| 23 | written direct to page 18. And there is a | 23 | period or subsets of it. |
| 24 | demonstrative No. 6 there. | 24 | Q. Changing topics then, sir, so now you conducted |
| 25 | Are you there, sir? | 25 | your analysis and concluded that low river flows |
|  | THE REPORTING GROUP |  | THE REPORTING GROUP |
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|  | 4386 |  | 4388 |
| 1 | A. Yes. | 1 | did not cause the collapse. Were you able to |
| 2 | Q. Okay. And, now, this demonstrative refers to | 2 | reach a conclusion to a reasonable degree of |
| 3 | annual oyster landings and mean daily river flow. | 3 | scientific certainty with respect to what did |
| 4 | Oyster landings there, is that fishery-dependent | 4 | cause the collapse of the fishery? |
| 5 | or independent data? | 5 | A. Yes. I certainly did. And it's what has caused |
| 6 | A. That is fishery-dependent data. That is the data | 6 | collapse in oyster fisheries across the country, |
| 7 | actually collected and downloaded by me from that | 7 | throughout the Atlantic coast, and worldwide as |
| 8 | FWC website. | 8 | to native oysters; and that is that it was |
| 9 | Q. Could you explain to the Court, please, what is | 9 | unsustainable harvest, which includes both |
| 10 | the analysis that you did here that led then to | 10 | harvest of the live animals as well as a lack of |
| 11 | your conclusion that there -- that low flows did | 11 | or degradation of the habitat, the resource, the |
| 12 | not cause the oyster collapse? | 12 | substrate, or shell that oysters require. |
| 13 | A. Well, one of the other potential predictions from | 13 | And that's because, if I could just go -- |
| 14 | the position that low flow and high salinity | 14 | oysters are unique in that in order to manage |
| 15 | caused the collapse would be that there would be | 15 | them correctly, that you have to consider both |
| 16 | some relationship -- some statistical | 16 | the live animal as well as the habitat, the shell |
| 17 | relationship between flow, as indicated in the | 17 | resource on which it lives. |
| 18 | blue line. And that's fishery-independent data | 18 | Q. And is one set of the data that you looked at |
| 19 | from the USGS Sumatra Gage -- that there would be | 19 | to reach the conclusion there was unsustainable |
| 20 | some relationship between flow and landings. And | 20 | harvest, the landings data we referred to |
| 21 | it could be at a time period, a lag of one, two, | 21 | before? |
| 22 | three years. | 22 | A. Yes. It was. |
| 23 | What that simply means is that the flow in a | 23 | MR. ECHOLS: And I would like to -- we |
| 24 | given year, if it were to affect the spat, their | 24 | have got some demonstratives I would like to |
| 25 | survival, then you wouldn't see that in the | 25 | hand out, if the Court would permit. |
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```
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Now, Professor Lipcius, what I have put up here
and provided to you as demonstrative No. 1, this
is a chart that the Court has seen a number of
times before that we used with the Florida
witnesses, which sets out the official FWC oyster
landings over the period of time from 1988 to
2015. What, if any, information can you draw or
did you draw from this landings data that relates to your conclusion that it was unsustainable harvest?
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Now, Professor Lipcius, what I have put up here and provided to you as demonstrative No. 1, this is a chart that the Court has seen a number of times before that we used with the Florida witnesses, which sets out the official FWC oyster landings over the period of time from 1988 to 2015. What, if any, information can you draw or did you draw from this landings data that relates
```

A. Well, one of the elements of my analysis was to examine fishing pressure on the resource. And one of the measures of fishing pressure is, of one of the measures of fishing pressure is, of
course, landings. There are other measures such as effort, such as the number of trips taken, and so on.

And what $I$ noted is that the landings in 2012, 2011 were the highest on record since the contemporary reporting -- mandatory reporting period. And this indicated to me that there was massive extraction of the live organisms as well as the shell from those organisms in that time frame.
Q. And you had mentioned that the other side of THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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unsustainable harvest is not only the removal of the oysters, but also the need to reshell; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. If we could look at the next demonstrative, what we have done there is we have just combined two demonstratives that the Court has seen previously. So on the landings side, we turned this into a line. And then we have the shelling information from before, which is an exhibit that's been used multiple times.

Would you please explain to the Court what is the significance, if any, of the relationship between the shell planting and the landings during this period?
A. Okay. So, first of all, just to orient you, the landings is on the right $Y$ axis, vertical axis; and that's the red line. The landings is just what was just previously shown, $\mathbf{2 . 8 1}$ million, 3.04 million. So that's the harvest rate.

And the blue bars indicate the level of reshelling. That's an activity that's been conducted for more than a century. It's recognized by all oyster fisheries and management agencies and such as a requisite for sustainable THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
harvest. And that's because you need to put back some of the habitat that you have extracted by taking out all the live animals.

And to sort of set a reference for the blue bars, the amount of reshelling that was done after the collapse of the oyster fishery after Hurricane Elena was between 200 and, I believe, over almost 400 acres; whereas here, immediately prior to and during the collapse, it was a fairly small, 35 acres you see for 2012, 16 acres for 2013.

So it was in my view from the contemporary record, a negligible amount of reshelling when you're extracting so much of the live animals and, therefore, the habitat, the shell.
Q. Now, if we could turn to the next demonstrative, Professor Lipcius, you asked if we could provide the Court something other than a bar or line graph. And, therefore, I have selected these two photographs here of a live and shell. Would you please explain why did you want the Court to see this?
A. Yes. So -- you know, when you see bar graphs, line graphs, or so on, for technical folks, like myself, those are adequate. But I think for your THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Honor and for the audience to really grasp what's going on, you want to actually see it.

So on the left side is a live large mature oyster, well over legal-size. You can't see it, however, because it's covered by spat. So that's the natural state of things. You have live organisms, live oysters. They serve as habitat, as the home, for the spat.

And in fact, on that one single live oyster there are probably around 10 spat or so.
Q. And the spat are baby oysters?
A. The spat are baby oysters.

On the right side, you have a shell. So no longer a live oyster, just one-half of the oyster shell. And, similarly, you see on that -- and you can see it's on someone's hand. It gives you a sense of size. You can also see there are about 10 or more spat there.

So when you remove those live oysters on the left, you have to put back the substrate, the reshelling, and sufficiently to provide a home, to provide habitat for the baby oysters.
Otherwise they swim in the currents and are lost in the system or die. They only have a week's window when they can actually find habitat and THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
settle. If they don't settle on that habitat, if they don't do that in that time period, they're gone. They're dead.
Q. I would like to turn back to your written direct, if we could, please.

MR. ECHOLS: And I direct the Court up to page 36, the demonstrative No. 12.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Okay. Are you there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this, sir, this demonstrative No. 12, is this another part of the analysis you conducted to determine that there was unsustainable harvest leading to the collapse of the oyster fishery?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And just a moment or so ago, Mr. Qureshi mentioned CPUE, which is referenced here.
A. Correct.
Q. Would you please explain to the Court what this analysis consisted of?
A. Okay. So as I mentioned before, we use in fishery management these two types of data. We use the fishery-dependent; that is, landings data and the like. Fishery-independent data, surveys.

This is fishery-dependent data. And on the THE REPORTING GROUP
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left side, and which is the bars, those -- that's the number of fishing trips. That's a measure of the effort exerted by the fishery. The other measure, of course, is the landings. The CPUE is simply the landings divided by the number of fishing trips. And we use this as a measure of fishing effort and fishing -- actually fishing performance or efficiency.

And what it shows you is that starting at around 2009, there was decline in CPUE. If you look at that purplish rectangle and you look at the CPUE, you look; and it had dropped below the levels last seen since 1992. And it continued to drop.

This is a warning sign. This is a clear warning sign for fishery management that you need to examine this much more carefully. What's going on with CPUE? Why is it that you're getting such a lower catch? Is it because the population is lower, and you had the same number of fishers; or is it because you have the same population abundance, but fishing effort has increased dramatically?

And so what we -- what $I$ got from this is two things. No. 1, the fishing -- sorry. The THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
population abundance on the bars was not increasing. So what this meant is that the CPUE drop was happening because there was equal abundance of oysters; but the effort, the pressure on the oyster resource had increased significantly.

And, again, as I mentioned, this alone is a caution; it's a symptom that there may be a collapse underway. This has happened with many fisheries that have collapsed. You see this decline in CPUE.

And I need to also address the fact that this is how I used it. I used it as a measure of fishing performance, fishing effort, not of population abundance.
Q. And in laymen's terms, so a trip is -- correct me if this is wrong -- is the oysterman going out on their boat to harvest that particular day?
A. One day's fishing trip, yes.
Q. And if the CPUE is going down, there are more trips, but fewer oysters per trip being harvested?
A. That's correct.
Q. And, now, there is another analysis you did on the topic -- a subject called exploitation rate? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
A. Yes.
Q. If we could turn in your written direct to page 37, the next page, would you explain to the Court, please, what is exploitation rate.
A. Okay. So in fishery management, in stock assessment, we have what are called reference points, meaning these are the measures that we use to assess the status of the fishery. And there are two key ones. One is abundance or biomass; how much oysters are out there as you can detect from population surveys. The second one is what fraction of the population is being taken out by the fishery. And this is what this is.

Annual exploitation rate simply says that it's on a scale from zero to one. And, for instance, if you look at the horizontal dotted line, that's almost at .4. And what that is saying is if the exploitation rate is .4 , that means that every year the fishery is taking out 40 percent of all the oysters out there.

So, again, it's a measure of the effort and the landings that are being brought back and the mortality due to the fishery.

So I analyzed this to see had the THE REPORTING GROUP
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exploitation rate remained constant or so. And what I did was I looked at Dr. Pine's -- I used Dr. Pine's data from this; and I calculated the annual exploit -- he had monthly exploitation rates. I calculated the annual exploitation rates from those. And that's what you see graphed here.

Now, the exploitation rates, again, were at the highest level; so the fraction that's being extracted is at the highest levels. And it's at a time, especially in 2012-2013, when the population is down. So what that means is that they're taking out a higher fraction of the oysters just when the population is in decline. And that is definitely one of the elements of extraction that -- of the population that can lead to collapse.
Q. What, if any, relationship does the need for reshelling have to do with exploitation rate?
A. Well, as I mentioned, what -- to maintain a sustainable fishery, if you're taking out more oysters, more of those live animals that provide substrate for the spat, you have to put back more. So you have to reshell at higher levels. And the problem is -- and that's actually what THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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the State of Florida did, as I believe you will see in a bit, after Hurricane Elena. They reshelled at record levels, and the population recovered.

Here, in contrast, they were extracting at record levels, but reshelling at some of the lowest levels in the record.
Q. Let's actually turn to that so that the Court can look at the specific numbers.
MR. ECHOLS: If we go to the demonstratives, your Honor. And this would be demonstrative -- is it 5 -- 4, demonstrative 4.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. And here, we have graphed your -- based on the joint exhibits of the states, the amount of reshelling that was done by the State of Florida during this period.

And would you explain to the Court what you were just referring to there with the post-Hurricane Elena reshelling activity?
A. Sure. What $I$ was referring to is that this is a really good example of an effective response to a -- in this case a natural disturbance. And after the passage of Hurricane Elena, basically THE REPORTING GROUP
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the fishery collapsed. Most of the oysters were killed either because of too much fresh water, low salinity -- they're called freshets in the oyster literature -- or siltation, basically just covering the oysters. And so the fishery collapsed. And the response of the State of Florida was quite effective. They reshelled, as I said, at record levels. They imposed management actions, restrictions.

And so with those two items, that allowed the oyster population to basically recover from the resource and have the sufficient habitat for the spat to settle on.
Q. Do you have an opinion, sir, whether the oyster fishery would have recovered more by today, by 2016, had the levels of reshelling been done at the same amount as Hurricane Elena, if in 2013 and 2014 Florida had reshelled to that extent?
A. Most definitely. I'm convinced that given what we have seen in other oyster fisheries, that's exactly what happened in the Great Wicomico River that I mentioned. We didn't put out live oysters. All we did was reshell on that system. And there were sources of larvae; that is, the spat that settled on there in record numbers. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

And they just needed the substrate.
Same thing here. There are sources of larvae, sources of the spat, the baby oysters, just like we see after Hurricane Elena. So had there been sufficient substrate and effective management actions, there clearly would have been, I think, an almost immediate recovery in 2014 and ' 15 because oysters are fecund. That is, they put out a lot, a lot of larvae. And one oyster can release a couple million larvae, a single oyster.

And they are out there. They're looking for the habitat. When you don't have it, that's it. You're going to collapse.
Q. You mentioned a couple of other management actions that the State of Florida took after Hurricane Elena.

MR. ECHOLS: If we could have the next demonstrative, please.

## BY MR. ECHOLS:

Q. You already touched on the habitat restoration. But would you mind just briefly describing for the Court what these other management actions were.
A. Right. So they actually covered three of the key THE REPORTING GROUP
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$\square$
parts. If you look at Hurricane Elena, the first part, it prohibited all harvesting in the bay for eight months. They were allowing it to sort of refresh itself.

They added the habitat; that's in the second part. They reshelled, as I said, at record levels, 345 and 220 acres.

Thirdly, they also wanted to make sure that people weren't harvesting illegally. So they established check stations to monitor and ensure compliance. And this is essential, because worldwide, one of the biggest problems to manage oysters is, in fact, illegal activity. And, of course, they prohibited all sub-legal oyster harvest.

And contrast that to what happened after the -- during and after the 2012-'13 collapse, the bay was never fully closed. Restore -restoration was only 16 acres in 2013. And then it did increase to 100, 135. However, they need more. They're -- that needs to be more reshelling to provide the habitat. There were no check stations in place.

And though this isn't quantitative, fishery-independent data, there were many reports THE REPORTING GROUP
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of unsustainable harvest and overharvesting of illegal and sub-legal oysters, including oysters as small as 1 inch. The legal size is approximately 3 inches. And you're seeing these tiny oysters out there.

THE WITNESS: Most of which are males, by the way, your Honor.

BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. I'll let the Court ask you that at the end there, Professor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
BY MR. ECHOLS:
Q. Changing topics, you were here a couple of weeks ago, sir, were you not, when Mr. Tommy Ward testified?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And you understand that Mr. Ward had -- has a couple of private leases that are not publicly harvested?
A. Correct.
Q. Could you -- and could you explain to the Court, you know, why is it, given that these were private leases that he controlled the level of harvesting, why were Tommy Ward's leases harmed, you know, if -- to the extent he says that they

THE REPORTING GROUP
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were during the collapse?
A. Well, it's -- in my view, it's quite unfortunate.

MR. ECHOLS: If we can put up the next demonstrative here, that may assist.
A. So this is a -- a view -- a map of the bay. And Tommy Ward's leases are in that westernmost part of the bay. You have them circled in red. And they're only about, I believe, four leases; and they're all in that area. In other oyster fisheries, you have leases throughout the system.

But, in any case, as I mentioned earlier, the -- that part of Apalachicola Bay is -- has some of the highest salinities. And so what $I$ would expect is that -- as I mentioned, you expect localized mortality in certain places. And if I were to predict where you're going to have the highest levels of mortality, it would be exactly in those areas in the high salinity areas. And that was really an unfortunate issue.

And then that was compounded by the fact that Mr. Ward did not just harvest from there. In fact, I believe from his numbers, he would get approximately $\mathbf{1 0}$ percent of his product. The rest of it he would buy from -- from the oystermen throughout the bay. And that's what THE REPORTING GROUP
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actually works in many oyster fisheries is they have a diverse portfolio. They have leases in low salinity, moderate salinity, and high salinity areas.

This is, for instance, the way the State of Louisiana's oystermen worked. I have talked to them directly about that. They have that because there are some years when you have too much fresh water coming into the bay. And the oysters that are close to the river mouth will die, but the ones that are at moderate salinity or high salinity will do very well. And that's what they harvest.

And in years of very high salinity, you're going to have localized mortality in the high salinity areas. So there, they get their product from moderate and low salinity areas.

And that's what Mr. Ward had, sort of that portfolio that he had prior to the collapse. After the collapse, then he no longer had a source from the rest of the bay; plus his leases are in those high salinity areas that are prone to higher mortality.

So in my view it was just an unfortunate situation. Were he to have leases in lower THE REPORTING GROUP
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Now, sir, as part of your work, do you -- you also evaluated the expert opinions offered by Drs. Kimbro and White; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in your direct testimony -- and we don't need to go into detail -- you identify a number of flaws that you found in those analyses. Just at the highest level, do you recall that Dr. Kimbro said that the methodology included his observations, experts, and then the mathematical modeling that Dr. White did?
A. Yes.
Q. And let's look, if we could, please, at -- in Dr. White's written direct. And if I could refer you and the Court, please, to page 50 and paragraph 153. The paragraph 153 starts on page 49 , and then the figure is on page 50 there.

Now, sir, you understand Dr. White used an IPM model?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you familiar with IPM models?
A. I'm quite familiar with it. I'm a co-author on an IPM model for the Pacific oyster, yes.
Q. Could you explain to the Court, please, what is the conclusion that is reflected here in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Dr. White's analysis based on his IPM model?
A. You will have to excuse me. I'm laughing because when I first saw this, I had already read Dr. Kimbro's conclusions and then Dr. White's. And then I saw the graph, and I had to do a double-take. And I say that because the maximum difference in the population that you see here under the remedy scenario -- so instead of the normal conditions, the drought conditions that we have, one of the remedy scenarios requested by the State of Florida, the maximum difference in the population would be approximately 1.1 percent, around 1 percent, meaning that there would be a 1 percent, not 90 percent, not 80 percent decline in the population, basically a 1 percent decline difference between the two.

And that, to me, actually supports the position that river flow did not -- low river flow did not cause the collapse. It's just the opposite. And, literally, I had to look at this two or three times to make sure that I was reading it because it was so surprising.

So a 1 percent -- 1.1 percent difference is negligible. It's what the oyster routinely THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
experiences in the environment just due to all different sources of mortality.
Q. And what percent would you expect to have found if the lower flows had caused a collapse?

What percent of variation would you expect to find?
A. I would have expected to see no less than $\mathbf{5 0}, \mathbf{6 0}$, 80 percent or so. It definitely would have been an order of magnitude -- well, I would have expected to have good evidence that I would have seen something around 80 percent, a little higher, a little lower. And, instead, I saw 1 percent. So --
Q. Finally, Professor Lipcius, now, we had Mr. Berrigan here on behalf of the State of Florida and Mr. Sutton a couple of weeks ago. And I know you saw part of that testimony. Correct?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And those -- both Mr. Berrigan and Mr. Sutton testified that they believed that it was an inevitable consequence that all the oysters were going to die from predation or disease and that, therefore, it made sense for the fishery to allow the oystermen to continue harvesting. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Now, is it your opinion that it was an inevitable consequence that the oysters were going to die from predation or disease in 2012?
A. No. That -- that was an absurd statement. Basically the oyster has evolved with these organisms, with the drought conditions, and so on. And, yes, you might see a slight dip; but it has never caused a collapse. And that -- that is just a ridiculous statement to make.
Q. And having reviewed the DACS reports with the independent fishery data, are you aware or did you find any instance in any contemporaneous document of the State of Florida where it was indicated that they believed all the oysters were going to die anyway; and so the fishery allowed them to be harvested?
A. No. Never did.

And if I might add one other thing that -- I think something that wasn't cleared up, the disease element of -- during the drought conditions. And this is one of the reasons why $I$ didn't focus as much on Dr. Petes's work, as her work came up with a similar result as the University of Florida report, is that the disease levels were -- for dermo were at about 1 to 1.5. THE REPORTING GROUP
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A. It would depend on the time period.
Q. 2012.
A. At that time, no, I don't.
Q. Okay. Can you turn with me to tab 23, sir. There you will see a document designated as FX-957. And it's a report by Seafood Watch for the Gulf coast region. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And have you seen this before?
A. I'm sorry?
Q. Have you seen this before?
A. No. I'm aware of the program Seafood Watch, but I haven't seen this particular document.
Q. Okay. And you see that it's dated October 23, 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you see on the first page there's a disclaimer that says, Seafood Watch strives to ensure that all of our seafood reports and the recommendations contained therein are accurate and reflect the most up-to-date evidence available at time of publication.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Sir, now, if you turn with me to the first THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
page, you will see the various Gulf states ranked. Do you see there is a ranking associated with the State of Florida, sir?
A. It's on page 2?
Q. Yes. There's a chart with green and yellow on it.
A. Yes. I see it.
Q. And which state is assigned the highest recommendation score by Seafood Watch?
A. Looks like Florida, tong.
Q. Florida. And tong there, you understand refers to the method of harvest allowed in the state?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, turn with me to page 24 , sir, of FX-957.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you see there's a table there entitled Management of Fishing Impacts on Retained Species. Florida, dash, low concern. All other states, dash, moderate concern.
Do you see that?
A. I'm sorry. You're looking where?
Q. At the table on page 24 .
A. Where it says factor $\mathbf{3 . 1}$ ?
Q. That's correct.
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A. Okay. I'm -- I'm not seeing -- oh, recovery of stocks of concern?
Q. That's correct. It says Florida-low concern, as the title of the table we're looking at?
A. Oh, yes. Thank you.
Q. Okay. And where it says Florida, tong, if you read across the row, under management strategy and implementation, Florida is given highly effective status. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And what other Gulf state is given that status?
A. It doesn't look like any other.
Q. And under enforcement, what is Florida's status?
A. Highly effective.
Q. Okay. You talked a little bit, sir, about your analysis of oyster abundance; and we looked at the graph displaying the public -- or the major reefs, as you described them, and the minor reefs. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you conclude that the oyster abundance did not decline throughout the entirety of Apalachicola Bay either during or after the collapse. Right?

## A. Right.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. And to make that determination, you analyzed the abundance of legal and sub-legal oysters at nine different oyster bars throughout the bay from 2008 through 2014?
A. Correct.
Q. And based on that analysis, you concluded that substantial declines had occurred only on the major fished bars, and that the other bars remained healthy or actually increased in oyster abundance. Right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. And you talked about Dr. White's criticism of that analysis where he alleges you confounded the distance from the mouth of the river and, therefore, confused the amount of salinity that would impact each respective oyster reef.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And you disagree with that; don't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And, in fact, you performed an analysis to evaluate salinity at these different oyster bars; is that correct?
A. I did.
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is typically -- is affiliated with the Land Grant colleges in their respective states and carries out activities of giving advice and sometimes doing analysis as well of farming within the respective states.
Q. And do you know a Dr. John Beasley affiliated with the University of Georgia's Extension Service?
A. So as I sit here now, to be honest, that name does not ring a bell.
Q. He's a professor of crop and soil science at UGA. You don't know him?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Do you know a Dr. Scott Tubbs, also a professor of crop and soil sciences at UGA?
A. Again, as $I$ sit here now, $I$ don't remember the name.
Q. Are you familiar with a study involving those two individuals with Harvard University and University of Florida on rotations and how they can save water?
A. No. I haven't heard about that.
Q. Can you describe for the Court what a sod-based rotation is, please?
A. Well, I would be speculating if I did that. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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Q. Okay. Could you open your binder to tab 1, please.
A. Yes.
Q. And, sir, for the first part of my exam today I would like to understand what you did to prepare your analyses in your prefiled direct and, indeed, in your expert opinion. So let's start with this document, if we might, please. Have you ever seen this document before?
A. No. I don't believe I have.
Q. And you don't know what, if any, role Georgia Extension Services had in the preparation of this document?
A. No. The -- just to be clear, the document I'm looking at says University of Florida.
Q. Sir, are sure you don't know of a joint study by University of Georgia in Auburn and University of Florida as to ways to save water in the Flint River Basin?
A. I don't recall having reviewed such a study.
Q. Sir, I invite your attention in this document, tab 1, which is FX-960, to page 5, please.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And do you see there it says, sod-based tri-state project, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama?
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A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Could you turn with me, please, now to page 44 of this same presentation, again, FX-960.
A. Yes. I see that.
Q. And now, on that page, could you read to yourself the contents of page 44 of FX-960.
A. Yes, I read it.
Q. Would you know what other crops are meant to be rotated in the sod-based rotation being studied here?
A. I couldn't say beyond what's stated here.
Q. Cotton and peanuts, would that make sense to you given your experience with agriculture?
A. Well, given my experience and my review of the materials in this case, I would anticipate that if it's within the Lower River Flint Basin, it might well be cotton and peanuts.
Q. You have never seen any study that anticipates that a sod-based rotation could save 70 to 80 percent of irrigation water used on cotton and peanuts?
A. Including grazing and variable rate irrigation and the others that are listed here?
Q. Sure. You're aware, aren't you, that there are a number of farmers in the Flint River Basin that THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

4440 have farm ponds and also cattle. Right?
A. So I'm certainly -- I'm aware of farm ponds. I haven't been looking at anything with livestock.
Q. You're not familiar with the practices of raising livestock in connection with farming various crops in the Flint River Basin?
A. No. I can't say that I am.
Q. So you don't know how many farmers do or don't have livestock operations?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So, sir, if you could look now at page 45 of --
A. Yes.
Q. -- this particular document. And there, do you see the word Bainbridge on the title of the slide?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. You know Bainbridge is in the Flint River Basin; don't you?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know there's a gage that measures the flow of the Flint River at Bainbridge. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And it doesn't include all of the flows in the Flint River Basin; does it? THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

A. Yes.
Q. By Governor Deal of Georgia?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Have you seen this before?
A. I don't believe so, no.
Q. Could you read the second and third paragraphs of this story, please.

I called it a press release. I was mistaken. It's actually a story about a press conference.
A. Do you mind if $I$ read from the beginning just so $I$ understand the context?
Q. Yes, please. Sir, anytime you want to do that, you're welcome to.
A. Thank you.

Okay. I'm not going to read the entire thing unless you want me to.
Q. No. Actually, I'm going to focus with you, if I can, on the second and third paragraphs of this document. And in particular in the second paragraph where it says, Deal set limits on water use could be a disaster that could force farmers to change the types of crops by restricting irrigation. Do you see that, sir?

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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A. Yes.
Q. All right. You didn't do any analysis of that possibility; did you?
A. No. I -- but I looked at this analogous to what Dr. Sundig did. I looked at reductions in yields of existing crops.
Q. Now, sir, do you see the next line where the -the next paragraph where in the second sentence there's a reference to, quote, an artificial process that would be imposed on farmers?
A. I see that, sir.
Q. And then the line before that, there's an indication that farmers should be allowed to make the calls about what they do on their own, basing that on market prices and the commodities they produce. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do, except it doesn't say should. It just says farmers are allowed.
Q. Oh, fair enough. Farmers are allowed. They are allowed under Georgia law to make all those choices right now without any restrictions. Right?
A. Well, there are certainly restrictions they face in terms of, as you know, irrigation water and other things, but I don't believe in terms of THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
crop choice.
Q. There is no restriction at all in the amount of irrigation water they can apply to a particular acre of crop land; is there?
A. No. What $I$ was referring to is permitting.
Q. All right. So they have to have permits; right?
A. Correct.
Q. And there are thousands of permits that have been granted in the Flint River Basin. Right?
A. That's fair to say.
Q. Right. And the grandfathered permits in particular have very few, if any, limitations on any aspect of irrigation; do they?
A. Right. And the most recent permits are defined in accordance with different areas of connectivity and impact on the river.
Q. And there are about 30 of those?
A. There are a very small number; it may well be 30.

I don't recall the exact number that are in the most critical area of the three types of areas, the ones with greatest connectivity. And then --
Q. Well, there are certainly many --
A. -- there are --
Q. I'm sorry to interrupt you.
A. I was going to say there are more permits in the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
areas that do not have significant impact on the river.
Q. Even in the sensitive -- particularly sensitive areas, there are far, far, far more grandfathered permits than new permits with limitations. Right?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. Now, I want to focus for a moment on an artificial process, the phrase that I called out a minute ago from the second paragraph we were reading, third paragraph of this document. You're aware, aren't you, that there is, indeed, an artificial limit on the amount of water that can be used in Florida's part of the ACF basis by farmers. Right?
A. So I'm aware -- I have become aware of the permitting system there.
Q. Oh, you have become aware. Is that since your prefiled direct testimony?
A. No. It's actually since you and I spoke at my deposition.
Q. Okay. So you are aware of that.

Let's turn, if we could, to JX-45, which is at tab 2, please.
A. Yes.
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A. Yes, I do.
Q. And then if you scan that first paragraph there, do you see an indication that farmers can significantly reduce the amount of water needed by planting water-efficient crop varieties?
A. I'm sorry. Would you tell me again where that text is?
Q. Sure. I'm very happy to. The first paragraph of text -- not the title, but the first paragraph of text under goal 3 .
A. Oh.
Q. It says, while goal 2; and then it moves on from there.
A. Yes, $I$ see it now.
Q. And did you see the language I read just a moment ago?
A. Yes. By planting water-efficient crop varieties.
Q. Now, sir, you didn't do any analysis on the economic impact of planting water-efficient crop varieties; did you?
A. No. Again, I -- I followed on what Dr. Sundig had done. And since, you know, farmers are trying to make a living, indeed, to probably maximize their profits. And the water costs something, so I'm assuming that given the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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benefits and costs they face, that they would tend to be planting relatively efficient varieties.
Q. And we're talking about Dr. Sunding. Right?
A. Oh, did I say --
Q. You said Sundig, but --
A. Oh, I apologize.
Q. No, I know. We have been through this before. So I am sorry to correct you, but I won't do it again. So thank you.

Now, there are water-efficient varieties of corn, for instance; right?

They have been bred to use less water?
A. So there's -- there's been breeding of varieties of all of these crops, some to be more resistant to insects, some to be more resistant from competitive vegetation, and some to perhaps require less water.
Q. Now, you're aware, in addition to using water-efficient crops or choosing different rotations or different water -- more water-efficient crops, that there are a whole range of practices that can be adopted to use less irrigation water, like variable-rate irrigation. Right?
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done the same thing for peanuts 66 percent and peanuts 33 percent. We have a row for dry years and a row for all years.

And this is all drawn from the same data you used from the Shellman study. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And you would agree -- and I think you did in your deposition -- that these are fair representations of what the results were at these levels of irrigation. Right?
A. Again, I'm willing to -- we don't want to take time to go back to the original data. I'm willing to stipulate that this represents the original data.
Q. So you see 87 percent for cotton at 66 percent sprinkler; and, likewise, for peanuts at 66 percent sprinkler, 95 percent yield in dry years?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Okay. And there's, you know, plenty of data to be reviewed there; but the point I want to make, if I can ask you to turn back to tab 8, please --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that when you did your analysis, you didn't look at sprinkler 66 percent; you didn't look THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
at sprinkler 33 percent. You just compared sprinkler 100 percent to no irrigation at all?
A. The reason that $I$ did that is that $I$ wanted to focus on what were the costs of achieving Dr. Sunding's proposed remedy. He was assessing the cost. And it seemed to me that the method he used, which was perfectly cost-effective allocation across four or five variables, something like 2,000 different combinations of them, I couldn't see that being achieved. And, therefore, I sought to identify a means in which one could strive to achieve those reductions in applications of irrigation water. And that included -- rather than the $\mathbf{1 0}$ percent increments that he used, it was essentially equivalent to an irrigation buy-back, which --
Q. Okay. So you just assumed that people wouldn't irrigate at all?
A. I assumed that those would be the requirements that this -- that an entity such as the State or whoever could or would put in place.
Q. But you understand, don't you, that Dr. Sunding was attempting to limit irrigation to a perfectly rational economic and environmental level that
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met a number of needs?
He wasn't trying to eliminate in his deficit irrigation approach all irrigation; was he?
A. So I think what you said is right. I would change the words a little bit, and that is what he was attempting to do was to identify a perfectly perfect cost-effective allocation of irrigation reductions to get the most you could get with the least possible cost.

And I just didn't consider the instrument -the policy instrument that would be feasible to accomplish that, which is why I --
Q. I think you did and would agree with me that it's possible to run an auction; you just thought that the way he was doing it was a little too complex. Is that right?
A. My opinion is that an auction, because of the issue of connectivity, would not accomplish that cost-effective allocation.

Remember, the cost effectiveness is in terms of cfs, not in terms of water not applied.
Q. You remember our deposition; don't you?

And I asked you if it was possible to conduct an auction in the Flint River Basin. Right?
A. And I probably said it is possible.
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Q. Okay.
A. No, I'm saying but it wouldn't achieve his cost-effective allocation because it wouldn't take account of connectivity because the farmers aren't going to be economically sensitive to that.
Q. But you -- just to be clear, I think we're probably on the same page, sir; but I just want to be incredibly clear. You didn't look to see what would happen if those farmers were required to irrigate less than they currently do. Right?
A. So as $I$ sit here now, $I$ don't recall that $I$ looked at that alternative, what the economics would be.
Q. All right, sir. There are several other measures that we have talked about in this trial that Georgia could undertake. And to organize our discussion of those measures, I would like you to turn to tab 10 where you will find JX-154.
A. Yes.
Q. And, sir, I don't recall if you have seen this document before; but just for a minute, if you could to yourself -- and I won't burden you with much more reading, but just the last paragraph THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
A. So it starts, Director Turner?
Q. It starts, Director Turner. Exactly right.
A. You want me to read that paragraph?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Two paragraphs, plus I'm going to invite your attention to the middle of the second page where there are a number of bullets there. Do you see those, sir?
A. Yes. Should I read those now?
Q. Yes. We'll walk through them, so you don't have to read them all at once.

But I'll start with the fourth of the five, if I could, sir, acquiring easements for permanent removal from irrigation. You did analyze that; didn't you?
A. Yes. Well, in the sense of -- in two ways. One was in terms of the deficit irrigation modifications, I certainly did. And then also, when I looked at Dr. Sunding's hedonic analysis.

I'm assuming that easements are the same as buy-backs.

## THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
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> Q. Hedonic analysis is kind of an arcane word. That just means the amount of money that you would pay in order to grant or to obtain an easement. Is that basically how it would apply in this context?
A. It was his attempt to estimate what would be the cost to the State to --
Q. So we're talking about the State acquiring rights to remove people from their permitted amount of irrigation. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. So somebody who is permitted and had a grandfathered permit that wasn't restricted in any way might be bought out of the right to irrigate. They could still use the land for farming; they just wouldn't irrigate. Is that fair?
A. Yes. Under the proposal here, they would be able to have dry-land agriculture.
Q. Okay. Have you looked to see at all if the State of Georgia has the right to suspend irrigation on a grandfathered permit?
A. You mean legally has the right?
Q. Legally has the right.
A. So I'm an economist; I'm not a lawyer. I won't THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

## comment on that.

Q. Okay. We'll get back to that because I think it's an important question when you figure how much would it really cost the State.

And we're talking about the State paying here; we're not talking about farmers incurring costs. Right?

The State would pay them not to apply irrigation water; isn't that right?
A. That's right. I would say as an economist, the way I look at this -- and I think any economist would -- mainstream economics is that a cost is still a cost. If I'm doing a benefit-cost analysis, I'm looking at the costs in aggregate, whether they're paid by farmers, they're paid by the state government, or they're paid by the federal government.
Q. Well, that's fair; but you also have part of your analysis that looks at distributional impacts; don't you?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so if the State -- the entire State is paying farmers for a right to prevent them from irrigating, that's not necessarily the same as if farmers are just prohibited from irrigating in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart 4472 the Lower Flint. Right?
A. So if the State were paying them, it would not be the same. But the state revenues to pay them have to come from somewhere. It's either tax dollars, cutting education programs, cutting other programs for farmers. I don't know.
Q. Okay. But then you would look at how much money the State would pay and compare that to a different denominator than you would if you were looking at impacts on farmers in the Lower Flint. Is that right?
A. I'm sorry. I didn't understand about the denominator.
Q. This will just be a short departure from our document, but you have in your analysis a concept, gross regional product; don't you?
A. That's correct, sir.
Q. Like the gross national product, but it's regional?
A. Precisely.
Q. And for the ACF Basin in the State of Georgia, it's about $\$ 282$ billion; isn't it?
A. Yes. That's my recollection, something like that.
Q. And for all of the production of row crops in the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

A. Yes.
Q. -- you know, at actual prices. He gathered data from all the sources you would need to, and his number for the cost of an easement matches very closely what you got here in the delta between irrigated and nonirrigated farms on the USDA statistics.

So this shows a difference of $\$ 800$ where Dr. Sunding has $\$ 864$. Is that right?
A. Something else you might wish to look at would be when actual auctions were carried out, since they weren't carried out. And if you do the arithmetic with those, then you're going to find not a difference of $\mathbf{\$ 8 0 0}$; but you will find that the buy-back for those two years, 20 --
Q. 2001?
A. 2001, 2002.
Q. That's a one-year buy-back. Right?

Each of those is a one-year buy-back?
A. Yes, but I'm going to convert. I'm going to do the mathematics.
Q. Okay.
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A. I'm going to convert it to an ongoing buy-back. Instead of 854, we're going to get about 2,000 to \$2,500.
Q. You know, don't you, that USDA also looks at the one-year rental value, right, when it reconciles all these things?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And it looks at both the one-year data type of thing you just referred to and to the purchase price per acre. You know it does that; right?
A. Yes. All that I'm saying, counselor, is that if you look at the actual empirical experience of when in the -- in that part of Georgia auctions were carried out, what the prices were at the auctions, and then you do the -- essentially the reverse of the discounting in order to get a present value to find out what the ease -- what that implies the permanent easement would have been, then you find a -- my recollection is about \$2,500 instead of 854.
Q. You wouldn't take the position ever, would you, that the cost of obtaining this legal right, an easement, is greater than the actual cost of the acre itself. Right?
A. Well -- you mean, you're looking at these? THE REPORTING GROUP
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Q. Yes.
A. Well, again, I think these include many, many, many extremely small farms that were probably not even participating in the auctions. I don't know.
Q. Sir, there's actually a couple studies we can look at in Georgia where -- where this was evaluated, just like Dr. Sunding did. So if you could turn, please, to tab 14, FX-928.
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you probably have seen these studies before. Here is the first one. It's called Estimating the Value of Irrigation Water in Georgia. And, you know, this one does two things. One, it polls real estate agents to understand the difference in the value of an irrigated versus an unirrigated acre. And this is a little bit old, but it's just about \$800, 800 to a thousand; isn't it?

I'm just trying to save a little time. Have you seen this before?
A. I don't know if I have seen this one.

I flipped ahead; and I have seen the next one, if you would like to --
Q. Okay. And then $\$ 913$ per acre is their value of THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart irrigation water?
A. Are you referring to Petrie and Taylor?
Q. I'm referring right now to Spurgeon,

S P URGEON, and Mullin, M U L LIN.
So I'll turn the page with you; and we'll go to tab 15, FX-925, Real Estate Analysis and -analysis. And you would agree with me in this article, which you have seen before -- the article is titled Estimating the Value of Water Use Permits -- the information they got from real estate agents is that the difference between an irrigated acre and a nonirrigated acre is about five to $\$ 700$. Right?
A. So I did review this because Dr. Sunding referred to it, and $I$ referred to it as well. This has in common something quite important with Dr. Sunding's hedonic analysis is that given the method he uses, he's not estimating the value of irrigation. He and Petrie and Taylor are valuing -- are looking at the value of the option to irrigate. And they're quite different.
Q. Well, you know -- I'm sorry, sir. I don't mean to interrupt you; but you know, don't you, that USDA, when it calculates the value of an acre of irrigated land, it includes the irrigation
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A. That's -- yes.
Q. Now, where did you get your information about streamflow?
A. So the -- it depends on which ones you're looking at. The streamflow for Sunding's are from Sunding's testimony from his February, his May, and his prefiled direct, I believe. The ones from my own are from the analysis that I have carried out.

So, for example, the one that you may well remember, just to trigger, you know, the memory, if you look at the second of mine where it says, full deficit irrigation, row crops only, the 678 was -- that was the point at which in my analysis -- do you recall the table -- actually ran out of available land.
Q. I remember your tables. So --
A. That's where that comes from, sir.
Q. But you're not the hydrologist that did this analysis? You're not a groundwater hydrologist?
A. No. I drew -- I drew on the experts in hydrology for the input to that, yes.

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
Q. So which expert did you get your cfs modeling information from?
A. So the cfs, the impacts were -- were drawing on Sunding's work and then modifying the acreage that would apply. That was, I believe, from Dr. Panday.
Q. And did you use Dr. Panday's and Dr. Bedient's numbers about surface and groundwater?
A. For connectivity?
Q. Yes.
A. For the connectivity I believe I was using maybe the same as Sunding's. The difference ways in terms of the seasonal impact factor, $I$ believe.
Q. Well, let me ask you this. There is an analysis that I'm sure you had to employ about how much water would flow down the Apalachicola.

And these are your numbers. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. 616, 678 --

THE REPORTER: Okay. Wait a minute.
BY MR. PERRY:
Q. -- 682, and 855.

I'm looking at the clock. I'm almost done.
Sir, did you rely on Dr. Bedient's analysis
in his running of ResSim to get these very
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specific numbers?
A. Actually, I can explain it. These numbers come out of the simulations that $I$ was doing having made what I thought were appropriate adjustments to Dr. Sunding's analysis.
Q. Okay. And those simulations didn't include all of the information that, and we talked about earlier, that you didn't analyze. Right?
A. In terms of other measures, this particular one is only looking at full deficit irrigation. Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you, sir.

There is one issue -- one very short issue that I just want to approach; and it has to do with outdoor water use --
A. Correct.
Q. -- in metro Atlanta. And I believe you estimated that there would be a huge cost associated with cutting outdoor water use by, say, greater than 50 percent or 75 percent in a severe drought; is that right?
A. So it turns -- that cost turns up tremendously between 50 percent and $\mathbf{7 5}$ percent; and you see the result in this table.
Q. Here is my question. You know, putting the THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart difficult parts of your calculations aside for a moment, how much do you really think a homeowner would pay per month to irrigate a lawn during a drought?
A. So, you know, I'm not going to speculate on that. This is not only about, you know, irrigating lawns. This is all outdoor water use.
Q. Right. But the vast majority of what Sunding --

Dr. Sunding focused on was irrigating lawns.
A. Yes.
Q. So do you think that -- and I'm thinking about your number. Do you think that there are many of your neighbors that would pay two or \$3,000 a month to keep their lawn green during the summer?
A. I don't want to speculate.
Q. Okay. Thank you, sir. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Stavins.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I would like to take one large step back, and can you just introduce yourself to the Special Master and explain your educational background and what you do for a living.
A. Sure. So I'm Robert Stavins. I'm the Albert THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart


```
A. Yes. This is exclusively M & I water use in the
    Atlanta metropolitan area.
Q. So let's turn to tab 2 and look at economic
output and activity in the agricultural sector
that uses water. Can you tell the Court what you
found when you looked there?
```

A. So when we looked at the commercial value of agriculture within the ACF region of Georgia, if we first look at row and forage crops, we see $\$ 1.3$ billion in commercial value per year. And then if we extend that to look at all agricultural commodities -- so I repeat the 1.3 billion in the second set, so we can add them up -- see that grand total comes to close to $\$ 5$ billion annually of commercial value.
Q. Dr. Stavins, the term benefit-cost analysis came up several times on your cross-examination. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. PRIMIS: And Mr. Perry, like me, knows that when you talk to Dr. Stavins, you call it a benefit-cost analysis, not a cost-benefit analysis.
BY MR. PRIMIS:
Q. Is that correct?
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A. That's correct, yes.
Q. So I'll stick with your term.
A. Thank you.
Q. Can you explain what you mean by a benefit-cost analysis?
A. So a benefit-cost analysis, which is absolutely central to economics broadly, and as well to environmental and natural resource and agricultural economics, is an assessment of the economic value of the benefits of a proposed policy compared with the cost of the proposed policy. In order to look at the benefits and the costs, we have to look at a change in both cases. Typically, a change from the status quo or business as usual to what the world will be like if the policy goes into effect, both on the benefit side and the cost side.
Q. Is this an accepted methodology in your field?
A. Absolutely. The literature goes back 75 years. It's the core central of economics.
Q. How about government literature? Anything from the government supporting this idea of a benefit-cost analysis when looking at changed environmental policies or proposals?
A. So certainly in the federal government where my THE REPORTING GROUP
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greatest experience is, it's core to activities in the following sense. So all regulations that are above a threshold cost of $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0}$ million per year are required to carry out what is called a regulatory impact analysis and submit it to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs for approval. To guide that effort OMB has developed Circular A-4 which provides the framework to be used.

The other highlight I would mention would be at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. There, we also already saw -- and counselor referred to them -- the economic analysis guidelines. Those are in my opinion the best guidelines that exist now in the federal government in any of the departments and agencies of how to do a regulatory impact or benefit-cost analysis.
Q. Dr. Stavins, one thing we discussed with

Dr. Sunding is whether it's appropriate to value alleged ecological benefits. How do you approach that situation?
A. Well, so it is not always easy; but it is fully appropriate. Indeed, there is a very large literature in academia, and I would estimate THE REPORTING GROUP
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thousands of articles, maybe tens of thousands of articles of developing methodologies and applying methodologies for estimating the benefits associated with ecological impacts.
Q. Did -- have you -- you have reviewed the Florida expert work on economics in the case. Right?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Have any of Florida's experts, whether they submitted testimony or were not put forward to submit testimony -- did any of them conduct a benefit-cost analysis of Dr. Sunding's proposed conservation measures?
A. No. I don't believe that $I$ have seen $a$ benefit-cost analysis in any case.
Q. Is that significant to you in this case?
A. Well, I was very surprised by it, to be, you know, honest. The first thing I thought I would see from Florida would be a comparison of benefits and costs.
Q. Did you perform a benefit-cost analysis in the case?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Can you turn to demonstrative 3 .
A. Yes.
Q. Does this reflect your benefit-cost analysis?

Q. And what's your view on that?
A. Well, I was very, very surprised to read that. There are entire literatures in environmental economics, again, going back $\mathbf{5 0}$ years or more looking at methods that can be used and have been used repeatedly in published, refereed journal articles and documented in dozens of books for valuing in economic terms the benefits that would be forthcoming from ecological services in general ecologies. So I found it very, very surprising.
Q. Dr. Sunding also testified at the trial that Florida has spent something like almost half a billion dollars to preserve the Apalachicola River and Bay, and that that's an indicator of the value of the resources there. Do you recall that testimony?
A. I do recall that.
Q. Do you agree that these expenditures that Florida has made to purchase land in the Apalachicola Bay region are an indicator of value for the Apalachicola River and Bay?
A. No. I strongly disagree with that.

Indeed, in the environmental economics course that I have been teaching at Harvard for about 25 THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
years now, actually there is a segment in one of my lectures which is dedicated to explaining why looking at such costs are not an adequate measure of the benefits. Indeed, they are an example of what I think it's fair to say is committing the most egregious error in a benefit-cost analysis; it's confusing the costs and the benefits.

Those are the costs of preserving the land. They are not the benefits of preserving the land.
Q. Does -- even taking Dr. Sunding at his word that it's half a billion dollars in value, did he estimate the change in value based on any conduct by Georgia?
A. So even if that were a correct measure of benefits, which it categorically is not, one has to look at what is the change in the value of that land as a result of one of the remedies, because it's not as if the land is going to totally disappear and then is preserved as a result of the remedy. So you have to look at the impact.
Q. Did anybody do that?
A. No.
Q. And what's the time frame for Dr. Sunding's estimate of almost half a billion dollars?
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A. My recollection is that it's $\mathbf{5 0}$ years.
Q. And did Dr. Phaneuf actually annualize that value?
A. Yes. Dr. Phaneuf took a similar approach, which I critiqued previously. And he estimated that the annual amount was $\mathbf{\$ 2 5}$ million.
Q. And how does that $\$ 25$ million per year figure compare to the cost that you have estimated that would accrue to Georgia from Dr. Sunding's remedy scenarios?
A. Well, whether or not we call it de minimis, we would certainly call it vastly smaller than the $\$ \mathbf{8 0 0}$ million.
Q. Now, Dr. Stavins, Dr. Sunding presented a chart. And I don't know if Mr. Smith can call it up. It's table 4 of his direct at 44.

I don't want to take the time to pass it around, but we have got it on the screen.
A. Yes.
Q. And do you see that for a number of proposed conservation measures, he has an incremental fiscal cost per year of zero?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And this is from his 2,000 cfs scenario. Correct?
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A. Correct.
Q. Do you believe that undertaking these scenarios would have zero cost to Georgia?
A. No. I don't believe that. And for some of them, in his previous materials submitted as part of his case, he actually did have positive costs, as I recall.
Q. Were they significant positive costs that Dr. Sunding previously estimated?
A. Yes.
Q. And Dr. Sunding testified that it was appropriate to assign zero cost to these because such costs are associated with implementation of Georgia's own existing policies.

I think Mr. Perry asked you about this, but I'm not sure you had a chance to fully explain your view on that.
A. So I think it's an important point that we previously discussed that whether or not there is a policy to do something, there is still a cost associated with it. If one wishes to remove it from the baseline on the cost side, then we have to take out the cfs numbers that are there as well.

I would think the best thing to do is to keep THE REPORTING GROUP

Mason \& Lockhart
it in place for both. To have the cfs numbers, which would be on the potential benefits if they were properly monetized, and also to have the proper cost numbers.
Q. Okay. Let's shift gears now, and I want to discuss irrigation in Georgia and ask you did you analyze the yield impact on crop yields if you eliminate irrigation on various crops in the ACF Basin?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you turn to demonstrative No. 4.
A. Yes.
Q. What does demonstrative 4 show?
A. So this is looking at the impact of irrigation within ACF Georgia on the yields of three -- the three principal crops, cotton, peanuts, and corn. And you can see that in the case of cotton, for example, with irrigation in a dry year, the anticipated yield from experimental farm data -this is empirical data, not modeling -- is 1500 bushels -- pardon me, pounds approximately. It drops to 329 pounds, again, from empirical experimental data, if there is lack of irrigation.

And then similarly for peanuts, 5,050 drops THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
to $\mathbf{2 , 4 7 1}$. And in the case of corn, it's even more dramatic going from 183 bushels now down to 13 bushels.

So the percentage differences for cotton, peanuts, and corn are respectively 78 percent drop, 51 percent drop, and 93 percent drop.
Q. In this chart, which comes from your direct testimony at page 11, you're comparing irrigation versus dry-land farming. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So that's no irrigation?
A. That's correct.
Q. Just looking -- leaving it to rain?
A. That's correct.
Q. And Mr. Perry asked you about 66 percent and 33 percent and whether you had looked at those. Do you recall that?
A. Yes, $I$ do.
Q. And I think you were trying to make a point about whether that's feasible or not. And he told you you could wait for me to come up.

So I'm here. What were you trying to say about the feasibility?
A. So what I wanted to explain was that Dr. Sunding's approach under his deficit THE REPORTING GROUP
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irrigation specified an ideal, a remarkable
ideal, which would be a cost-effective allocation across 2,000 different combinations of connectivity, soil type, 10 percent increments of reducing irrigation, and crop type.

I don't see that the government could achieve that for reasons we can discuss. And, therefore, I wanted to -- in order to estimate cost, to estimate what are sensible costs of what it would actually -- of what is a remedy that could be used and the one that was closest to Dr. Sunding's, because I wanted to stick close to what he was doing, was one in which it would be what is now being discussed in terms of irrigation buy-back, although we were talking on an annual basis. In other words, land being either irrigated or nonirrigated. And so I looked at that in terms of these differences in yield.
Q. Now, Dr. Stavins, did you also look at the percentage of crop production in terms of irrigated acres in the ACF Basin?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Because there's been a lot of debate and discussion about whether irrigation is necessary THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
or discretionary and its relative value. How did you try and get at that issue?
A. Well, I'll tell you, counselor, I had never before in an economic analysis heard this word discretionary used. Almost every input to production for most goods and services is ultimately discretionary. The key issue is if $I$ don't have that input or $I$ reduce the amount of that input I use, what does that do to benefits? What does that do to costs?

So I didn't see in the first place that pointing out that there were some -- there was some acreage that didn't use irrigation was telling me that it's, therefore, discretionary.
Q. Can you turn to demonstrative 5, please.
A. Yes.
Q. And explain what you have shown there.
A. So looking -- even if we think that making these kinds of comparisons says something about whether it's discretionary or not, looking at either the number of farms or the number of acres is potentially very misleading. What I want to look at is what percentage of the production of those crops is coming from an irrigated acre as opposed to a nonirrigated acre. So that's what I have THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart



community, is that it is my opinion that the vast majority of environmental and natural resource economics participate in -- you know, in this literature; and they subscribe to the methods.

These methods are central to environmental economics. They're not the fringe whatsoever. And they're taught at universities from Maine to California, and as well as at my own institution at Harvard.
Q. Did you take a poll here to do a contingent valuation?
A. No, I didn't take a poll; but I did look at -and consulted what other universities and faculty members that $I$ hold in high regard are doing.
Q. Now, just to be a little more precise, what you're espousing is a process where a bank of telephone callers call individuals and read them a statement; and they answer from, likely, among some multiple choice alternatives. And you prefer that to any type of other analysis that might take into account what the state does to value the property, what purchases they have made, and so forth. Right?
A. So if a true revealed preference approach were available for the environmental amenity we wished THE REPORTING GROUP
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to investigate, I would probably prefer the revealed preference approach.

The approach you just mentioned of looking at how much the State spends is really making that egregious error that is looking at a cost and pretending that that's a benefit.
Q. And your position there is that the representatives of the state, the people of the state and the state legislature, when they voice their views and allot budget to buying land, which Secretary Steverson testified about --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in his prefiled direct, that's completely irrelevant to the value of the resource. And, instead, you ought to take a poll?
A. My position, sir, is that if that $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0}$ million was coming out of the pockets of the legislators, that would be a revealed preference method and would demonstrate the benefits to them. That's -- but when it's someone else's money that's being spent through a political process, that's turning benefit-cost analysis on its head. That would eliminate the role for WIRA at OMB. Anything the government does has got to be big benefits because they spent a lot of money.
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Q. Well, sir, the Obama administration recognized, did it not, in its amendment to Executive Order 12866 that nonuse, in other words, the natural value of the resources, can't always be quantified because it can be priceless and not subject to analysis through a poll?
A. So I think, you know, look, if you were talking about, you know, my children, I'll agree with priceless. But when we're talking about these natural resources for which there are true opportunity costs, I don't agree with the word priceless.

And what I would agree with is that sometimes it's very difficult to measure them; but it is not impossible. And, counselor, it is done every day. It's done by government. It's done in litigation. And it's done in academic studies. That's the reality. That's the simple fact.

MR. PERRY: Well, may I approach to pass out one last --
A. Thank you.
Q. All right, sir. Looking now at JX-65 that I just passed out, who is the author, Jerry Hausman?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm sorry. Who is the author?
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A. Jerry Hausman.
Q. And can you describe his background and his current position?
A. So Professor Houseman is an economist. He may now be Professor Emeritus since this was written, but was for a long time a professor in the economics department at MIT. His expertise is econometrics. He's not an environmental or resource economist.
Q. Now, when you -- on tab 3 of the binder

Mr. Primis gave you -- that's the small binder -when you said the benefits of restricting irrigation upstream were zero, that's basically a determination there's nothing to be gained from more water flowing downstream. Right?
A. I didn't say there was nothing to be gained. What I said was that I can estimate the impacts on the oysters based upon Dr. Jenkins's work, the Florida witness, and that my understanding from other experts in the case from Georgia was that the biophysical impacts of the remedies were trivial or, as you say, de minimus; so, therefore, $I$ interpret that as being the benefits were de minimis.
Q. Now, Dr. Jenkins didn't testify here; did he? THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { JX-45 [2] - 4286:10, } \\ & 4448: 23 \end{aligned}$ | laboratory [1] - |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legal-size [2] - } \\ & 4384: 16,4392: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4352: 14,4354: 2 \\ & 4354: 10,4354: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| JX-47 [2] - 4286:10, | 4316:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 4354: 10,4354: 24, \\ & 4355: 2,4355: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 4493:15, 4494:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legally }[2]-4470: 23, \\ & 4470: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Laboratory [2] - 4458:18, $4461 \cdot 25$ | 4355:2, 4355:4, <br> $4355 \cdot 7,4355 \cdot 9$ | 4495:5, 4495:23 |  |
| JX-50 [4] - 4286:11, | 4458:18, 4461:25 | $4355: 7,4355: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lawn [2] - 4504:3, } \\ & 4504: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legislators [1] - } \\ & 4538: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 358: 18,4359: 2, \\ & 359: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lack [3] - 4310:24, } \\ & \text { 4388:10, 4521:23 } \end{aligned}$ | 4386:4, 4386:20, | lawns [2]-4504:7, | legislature [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { JX-65 [2] - 4286:11, } \\ & 4539: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\boldsymbol{l a g}[1]-4386: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4387:1, 4387:9, } \\ & 4387: 13,4387: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 4504:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { legislature }[1] \text { - } \\ & 4538: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | lags [1] - 4387:3 |  | laws [1] - 4491:16 | Leitman [2] - 4349:14, |
| JX-77 [5] - 4286:12, | laid [1] - 4515:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 4387: 13,4387: 20 \\ & 4388: 20,4389: 7, \end{aligned}$ |  | 4349:17 |
| 4358:18, 4359:2, | Lake [1] - 4441:3LANCASTER [65] | $\begin{aligned} & 4389: 9,4389: 15, \\ & 4389: 18,4390: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { lawyer [3] - 4291:20, } \\ 4413: 17,4470: 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { length }[2]-4489: 25, \\ & 4535: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4359:14, 4372:17 |  | 4389:18, 4390:8, 4390:14, 4390:17, |  |  |
| JX-91 [1] - 4286:12 | 4288:5, 4290:12, | 4390:18, 4393:23, | lawyers [4]-4310:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { less [11] }-4411: 7, \\ 4444: 3,4454: 13, \end{gathered}$ |
| K | $\begin{aligned} & 4290: 15,4292: 11, \\ & 4293: 1,4293: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 4394:4, 4394:5, 4396:23 | 4547:10 | $4454: 18,4454: 24$ |
| Karl [6] - 4286:4, $4291.7,4294: 5$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4293:1, 4293:13, } \\ & \text { 4293:19, 4293:21, } \end{aligned}$ | landscaping [1] - | laymen's [1] - 4395:16 lead [8]-4324:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 4481: 6,4485: 22, \\ & 4531: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4291:7, 4294:5, } \\ & \text { 4295:11, 4302:2 } \end{aligned}$ | 4294:22, 4294:25, | $4508: 15$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { lead }[8]-4324: 16, \\ 4324: 25,4330: 8, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 4348:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4302:9, 4302:16, } \\ & \text { 4303:12, 4303:20, } \end{aligned}$ | language $[7]$ - 4353:17, 4362:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4397:17, 4413:25, } \\ & 4455: 11,4460: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lettenmaier [1] - } \\ & 4531: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| kee | 4307:16, 4309:15, 4311:13, 4311:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4362:24, 4453:15, } \\ & \text { 4457:1, 4515:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 4455:11, 4460:13, 4460:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { letter [3] - 4327:2, } \\ 4344: 8,4347: 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| 4383:12, 4476:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4311:13, 4311:21, } \\ & \text { 4312:3, 4312:13, } \end{aligned}$ |  | leading [2] - 4360:22, |  |
| 4486:18, 4504:14, 4520:25 | 4313:4, 4313:22, | large [4] - 4392:3, | leak [1] - 4513:24 | level [9]-4315:16, |
| keeping [1] - 4541:23 | 4314:2, 4314:7, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { learn }[1]-4499: 19 \\ & \text { learned }[1]-4290: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4330:23, 4390:21, } \\ & \text { 4397:9, 4402:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| keeps [1] - 4547:9 | 4318:21, 4342:3, | 4504:21, 4511:24, $4525: 10$ |  | 4409:8, 4413:3, <br> 4463:7, 4466:25 |
| Kennedy [1] - 4505:2 | 4342:7, 4371:23, | larger [1] - 4544:11 | lease [1] - 4408:24 |  |
| Kenneth [1] - 4349:7 | 4402:11, 4414:5,4426:7, 4426:10, | larvae [4]-4399:24, $4400: 3,4400: 9$, | leased [1] - 4341:13 | 4463:7, 4466:25 levels [18]-4325:2, |
| Kent [1] - 4371:9 |  | $4400: 10$ | leases [10] - 4341:8, | $4329: 6,4368: 15$ |
| kept [1] - 4547:1 | $4426: 13,4426: 17$ |  |  | 4394:13, 4397:10, |
| key [5] - 4330:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 4426: 20,4426: 24, \\ & 4427: 1,4427: 12, \end{aligned}$ | last [41]-4288:15,4292:12, 4297:6, | 4402:24, 4403:6, | 4397:24, 4398:3, |
| 4382:5, 4396:9, |  |  | 4403:8, 4403:10, | 4398:6, 4398:7, |
| 4400:25, 4524:7 | $4427: 23,4428: 4$ |  | OUP :2, 4404:21, | 4399:8, 4399:16, |















| 4493:18, 4493:24 | 4474:8, 4491:15, | 4529:15, 4530:1, | strive [1] - 4466:13 | subsets [1] - 4387:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stamps [1] - 4344:19 | 4492:11, 4499:14, | 4533:14, 4544:14 | strives [1] - 4417:18 | subsidies [1] - |
| stand [2] - 4344:3, | 4514:18, 4538:4, | Stavins's [1] - 4481:17 | strong [1] - 4289:24 | 4498:12 |
| 4495:1 | 4543:9, 4549:3 | stay [4] - 4292:9 | strongly [1] - 4517:23 | subsidized [1] - |
| standard [1] - 4380:3 | state's [1] - 4487:24 | 4296:21, 4433:25, | structure [4] - | 4499:5 |
| start [5] - 4304:8, | statement [11] - | 4462:19 | 4368:10, 4368:12, | subsidizes [1] - |
| 4365:17, 4438:7, | 4289:20, 4291:10, | stayed [1] - 4320:6 | 4368:16, 4376:11 | 4499:13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 4469:16, 4530:7 } \\ \text { started [1] - 4336:9 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4291:20, 4339:10, } \\ & \text { 4361:2, 4362:10, } \end{aligned}$ | staying [4] - 4304:13, 4305:11, 4321:8, | Struhs [1] - 4346:13 | subsidy [2] - 4498:25, 4500:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { started }[1]-4336: 9 \\ & \text { starting }[4]-4300: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4361:2, 4362:10, } \\ & 4370: 7,4412: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4305: 11,4321: 8, \\ & 4423: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { studied [2] - 4353:11, } \\ & \text { 4439:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4500: 9 \\ \text { substanc } \end{gathered}$ |
| 4335:20, 4340:6, | 4412:9, 4414:11, | stem [1] - 4381:25 | studies [6] - 4367:20, | 4507:21 |
| 4394:9 | 4537:18 | stenographic [1] | 4368:18, 4379:6, | substantial [4] - |
| starts [6] - 4315:13, | statements [5] - | 4549:5 | 4479:6, 4479:11, | 4336:11, 4406:9, |
| $4335: 21,4356: 22$ | 4300:23, 4338:25, | step [1] - 4504:21 | 4539:17 | $4420: 7,4531: 7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4409: 16,4469: 4 \\ & 4469: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4359: 24,4376: 9 \\ & 4424: 5 \end{aligned}$ | stepped [1] - 4289:10 <br> Steve [1] - 4349:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { study }[15]-4353: 18, \\ 4354: 17,4354: 18, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { substantially [1] - } \\ & 4481: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| STATE [2] - 4285:3, | STATES [1] - 4285:1 | Stevens [1] - 4369:1 | $4357: 11,4368: 2,$ | substantiate [1] - |
| 4285:6 | States [7] - 4343:3, | Steverson [1] - | 4368:9, 4370:7, | 4431:20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { state [22] - 4312:23, } \\ 4314: 21,4322: 7, \end{gathered}$ | 4343:21, 4345:4, | 4538:11 | $4437: 18,4438: 16$ | substantiated [1] - <br> $4431 \cdot 17$ |
| $4323: 4,4335: 15$ | $4474: 11,4544: 6$ | stick [2] - 4510:2, $4523: 12$ | $4461: 21,4465: 5$ | substrate [5] |
| 4379:7, 4379:16, | states [11] - 4340:14, | still [12] - 4297 | 4507:2, 4508:21 | 4388:12, 4392:20, |
| 4392:6, 4418:8, | 4340:15, 4360:22 | 4298:7, 4387:18 | studying [3] - 4380:6, | 4397:23, 4400:1, |
| 4418:12, 4419:11, | 4398:16, 4414:16, | 4406:17, 4470:15, | 4407:22, 4485:8 | 4400:5 |
| 4430:1, 4434:19, | 4418:1, 4418:20, | 4471:13, 4485:2, | sub [4] - 4384:17, | subtidal [1] - 4362:8 |
| 4438:24, 4471:16, | 4437:2, 4437:5, | 4499:6, 4499:11, | 4401:14, 4402:2, | successful [2] - |
| 4472:3, 4483:19, | 4506:18 | 4500:14, 4520:20, | 4420:2 | 4379:18, 4379:25 |
| 4498:13, 4537:21, | stations [2] - 4401:10, | 4529:9 | sub-legal [3] - | sufficient [3] - |
| 4538:8, $4538: 9$ | 4401:23 | stipulate [2] - | 4401:14, 4402:2, | 4399:12, 4400:5, |
| State [71] - 4285:15, | Statistic [1] - 4475:12 | 4465:13, 4535:12 | 4420:2 | 4432:14 |
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| 4343:20, 4344:16, | 4510:14 | stop [1] - 4320:1 | 4511:5, 4512:10 | suitability [4] - |
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