

PROCEEDINGS
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Good morning, counsel.

MR. WINSOR: Good morning.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Josh and Claudette and I are here.

Let's start by identifying the people who are on the line. First, Florida?

MR. WINSOR: Your Honor, this is Allen Winsor for Florida. And I'm here with Chris Kise and Osvaldo Vazquez.

MR. LEOPOLD: Also, Matt Leopold, your Honor, for the Department of Environmental Protection.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, this is Craig Primis from Kirkland \& Ellis, LLP. I'm here with my colleagues Sarah Warren and Winn Allen.

MR. PETERSON: Your Honor, this is Nels Peterson in the Georgia Attorney General's Office, and I'm here with my colleague Britt Grant.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Is there anyone else on the line?
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MR. GRAY: Yes, your Honor. Good morning. This is Michael Gray from the Department of Justice for the United States listening in.

MR. DUBOIS: And this is Jim Dubois. I'm also with the United States, your Honor. Good morning.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well,
Mr. Gray and Mr. Dubois, the -- I thought the CMO made it clear that only parties may participate in status conferences. Did you not read that paragraph 4 of the CMO?

MR. GRAY: I did, your Honor. I understood that to mean not actively participate, but that the United States could, as amicus, as we often do, listen in, particularly until we file our statement of intent. But if $I$ was wrong about that, I'm happy to hang up.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida, do you object to them staying on and listening? MR. WINSOR: No, sir, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No objection, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

For this conference, you may stay on and listen. But unless there's amicus filed, from this point on it will be as the CMO says, only participant parties. Is that clear?

MR. GRAY: Yes, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Let me begin by thanking counsel for -first, for getting together and submitting a joint submission. I think that's admirable and doesn't often happen in these things. And, secondly, for accepting my invitation to object if you quarreled with anything that $I$ put in any of the orders.

I hope you understand that Josh and I have a sense -- not an in-depth sense, but a sense of the complexities of the issues involved in this matter. We understand that they include hydrology, biology, economics, et cetera, et cetera. But other than this sense of complexities, are there any other reasons for the extensions or delays you have requested?

Florida?
MR. KISE: Your Honor, this is Chris THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Kise. I'm outside counsel for Florida.
I think you have hit on it in terms of in making the particular point, but I certainly wouldn't want to leave your Honor with the impression that that is at all a simple matter, really, just in terms of the volume and the time taken to not only gather and produce this information but, most importantly, to assimilate it and incorporate it into the record that will ultimately come before the Court. And we have at least attempted to provide and, hopefully, we have provided useful information to you about what we know now based on already our conversations, you know, in an attempt to move this forward long in advance -- well in advance of the start of the discovery.

And to give your Honor the sense -- a sense of how we think, based on our own conversations internally with our folks to date as well as with our experts -- a sense of the nature of what the undertaking will involve, the best estimates, just, again -and they're loose estimates. We haven't had a chance -- and we plan to, as we have stated THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
in our submission -- to sit down in far more detail here over the coming -- this weekend and the coming weeks to develop further our mutual understanding of what's going to be involved, but the -- the time taken to gather and produce and, as I mentioned also, to assimilate and incorporate all of this information into the various expert models that will be used to present the case ultimately to the Court.

Our knowledge, Florida's knowledge, to date is based primarily on public information, on information that we were able to glean both from our, you know, sort of independent review of what's out there. Certain of that is recounted for the court in our motion. I think the Motion For Leave pages 6 to 8 , page 16 and 17 , sort of lay out generally our understanding.

The Turner declaration, the declaration of the Georgia EPD director, also sets forth some understanding; but just from the Turner declaration, the court can get a sense of the volume. Mr. Turner references some -- I believe it's 19 or 20 separate counties just THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
encompassed within sort of the Atlanta metropolitan area that are in some shape, form, or fashion withdrawing water or dependent on water or look to the area for water. And each and all of those entities we would anticipate will have some hydrological information, some consumption information, some projections. And that, again, is just the Atlanta metropolitan area, not even beginning to travel down the Flint River and the agricultural areas.

And so what we have tried to present is, as $I$ said, an understanding of what we know now basically about the gathering and production, the time to assimilate and incorporate. We have staggered the schedule trying to give the Court also a sense of our view on the need for time in between the completion or the ongoing fact discovery and the time where experts will then be asked to actually submit opinions in the first instance. They're initial reports. And that schedule and that discussion that you see reflects our views, again now, based on -- of how much time really is going to be required THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
by our experts to assimilate all of this information.

What we're after to do is to try and do this in a way that, first and foremost, understands and respects your direction that you gave quite clearly at our first conference two weeks ago about the timeline and to demonstrate -- and, hopefully, we -we have done that -- that we are being as diligent as we possibly can under the circumstances by coordinating, by working together, by scheduling meetings, again, this week and in the coming weeks to really assess and address in detail the path forward for this case. And at least from our conversations -- and $I$ certainly won't speak for them, but from our conversations with counsel for Georgia, they are -- they had a like view.

And so apologies for giving you a -perhaps a longer response than your specific question called for but, hopefully, giving you some understanding of where we are.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: No. Thank you. The response is very helpful. THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

The problem $I$ have is that it's all prospective. How long, for example, have you had the Turner affidavit?

MR. KISE: Your Honor, we have had the Turner affidavit -- let me just look at the date when it came out, because I certainly don't want to misspeak. But it has been out there for some time.

And we have, as I mentioned, engaged in our own research from publicly available sources. But we have not been engaged in any discovery.

This is -- January 10 of '13 is the date of this; so $I$ would say, your Honor, we have had it somewhere shortly after it was prepared. The date of it is '13 -- January 2013 .

And so we have -- we have attempted -and I think we have done a good job, without revealing anything that would be considered privileged or work product, of gathering what we can. But all of these various sources are really not ones which we have a complete and developed understanding of as to who has the information, how it's stored, and what

THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
information these various respective entities and agencies have. And that is certainly, I think, the principal purpose or a principal purpose of our discussions beginning in great detail this week with Georgia counsel is to sit down -- and, again, $I$ won't speak for their view of this; I'll just give you Florida's view -- is to sit down and go through in some detail where this information is, who has this information, how it's stored, how we're going to go about accessing it and gathering it, where there are areas we can come to agreement.

One of the challenges we have -- and you correctly point out, your Honor -- it is prospective in the sense that -- that we are really just learning about one another's information both in terms of what exists and how it's stored and how it can be produced. And it would seem a little bit counterintuitive; and $I$-- $I$ certainly can appreciate that given that this dispute between the states has been pending for many, many years; but as we tried to give your Honor some sense of in our filing, the issues THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
that have been debated in the various and multiple legal proceedings leading up to today all related to the Corps -- the Army Corps of Engineers' operation of the system. And they were administrative proceedings. And to the best of our records, recollection, research, there has never been any discovery, as we state in these -- in our filing, directly between the parties. There have been some informal exchanges of information -and by informal, I mean inadmissible in the settlement context. There were discussions going back, at least that $I$ have been part of, for the last 10 or 12 years. The most recent substantive discussions did not involve -- in the last two or three years, did not involve any meaningful exchange of actual data. The last time $I$ can recall the parties doing that was probably five or more years ago. And that was in the context of negotiations and discussions that the Army Corps of Engineers participated in. Those were put together by the Department of -- or arranged by the Department of the Interior. But all of that really related to the issues THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
in that litigation, meaning the Corps' operation of the system, not to the issues that we're seeking to explore and present to the Court here that will result in an equitable and fair distribution of water.

And as we have cited to your Honor, the Supreme Court has been somewhat liberal in allowing development of the facts in cases of this nature. And we would -- we would say that this case should not be that -- an exception to that, again, being mindful and respectful of the direction you provided very clearly at the outset that we need to move along expeditiously. And, hopefully, we are demonstrating that we have got that message; and we're moving along.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

Let me ask you to clarify. Are you saying that none of the information generated through the administrative procedures involving the Corps of Engineers is relevant or helpful to this proceeding?

MR. KISE: No, your Honor, I'm not saying none of it is. What I'm saying is THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
that the issues that were -- that we were litigating related to the Corps' operation of the system given a certain level of water. So -- so the -- what we're about here is how much water goes into the system. At least Florida will tell you that the issue here is not what does the Corps do with the water it has to distribute. The issue is how much water is there to distribute, how much of it is available for municipal industrial use and for agricultural use in Georgia and how much is available to flow downstream, the Corps' operation notwithstanding.

And so it would be inappropriate to leave -- to state or to leave you with the impression that the information gathered over the course of the last couple decades will not be useful or helpful; but it will not be, I think pertinent is probably the best word. Nor will it be really current. The last exchanges we had of information, as I mentioned, of anything meaningful even in those proceedings are now years dated. And they certainly predate the Turner declaration of January 2013. And can they -- and they THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
all predate sort of the landscape that now exists both from a climatic standpoint and from an operational standpoint, at least from the indicators we have from the Corps and the direction we received from the 11th Circuit.

So that information is there, but it is really comprised largely of an administrative record prepared by federal agencies. And it's not -- it doesn't really consist of the data that will be exchanged in the discovery process. The data in the discovery process relates to Georgia's actual -- from Florida's standpoint, Georgia's actual consumptive use information and projections and information on permits and allocations for water and various and sundry agricultural uses, conservation measures, evaporation, storage capacity. All of those types of issues really were not -- they just weren't presented other than in the context of federal agencies gathering information and preparing an administrative record. There was no exchange between parties. There was no experts of the nature and type that we have now. And so there really are no
experts, frankly, at all. A lot of the questions that we dealt with dealt with legal issues relative to the interpretation of certain federal statutes, the authorization of the Corps to engage in certain activities. And the experts and/or the testimony that was directed towards that, again, from federal agencies and filings submitted as part of the record all related to particulars relative to the Endangered Species Act, the Corps or the federal government's compliance with NEPA. Again, none of it really bearing on the questions that will be presented in this case, which $I$ would submit are very different -- very different questions.

And certainly Florida, being the plaintiffs, we are not only, again, mindful and respectful of the direction you have provided about moving the timeline forward but, like all plaintiffs, are interested in moving this case forward. And so I am certain in your career you have never encountered a lawyer that didn't want more time. I haven't either. But $I$ will say that this is not a circumstance where we are THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
seeking more time for its own sake or this is a -- we're, hopefully, representing to you a very thoughtful exercise and one where counsel on both sides have really moved very rapidly to -- to take your direction and develop something meaningful for the Court.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

Georgia, do you wish to supplement what Florida has reported?

MR. PRIMIS: Yes, we would, your Honor. One -- and we agree with much of what counsel for Florida just said. The one very positive effect that the Special Master's initial order has had is that the parties got the message that this case will move forward expeditiously. We have obviously proposed a different way of moving forward expeditiously, but we get the message. And we have already met and conferred three, maybe four times to start engaging in the work that both sides are going to need to do collaboratively to make sure both sides get the data they need to do this in a thoughtful and sensible way.

We have a plan -- we already have it on the calendar to meet up this Thursday where we are both going to start putting on the table in more detail the types of information and data that we foresee seeking and collecting in this case so that both sides can go back to their constituents and do the hard work of figuring out where it resides, whether it exists, if it does exist, in what format, what types of information technology systems these state agencies have.

I know on Georgia's side, we foresee at least six or seven different agencies with potentially different systems which will just, you know, pose some significant logistical issues for us as we try and dig up the information both for Georgia's sake and also to be responsive to Florida.

But the parties have not been waiting around to start that work in February. We got together and said, okay, we have a serious schedule here. The Special Master is intent on moving this forward. Let's get together and do it now.

And the parties are uniform on that. We THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
are in complete agreement and have been working collaboratively and cooperatively. I suspect there will be some points down the road where we disagree, but for the time being, both in terms of the scope of the work and the types of information, we are seeing this eye to eye. And the lack of prior discovery is important because we think that -- I think both sides believe that some, if not much, of the expert work that is going to have to be done in this case is going to be novel. There are going to be new models developed to assess the issues and allegations in this particular case on both sides of the state line. And in that regard, the experts are going to be collecting and looking at data in a way that the Army Corps had not previously done.

Now, the only place where $I$ have a slight disagreement or perspective from my colleague from Florida is on the role of the Army Corps. They are generating relevant information. And one further complicating factor is that the Army Corps is going to be updating its water supply manual this THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
summer -- this coming summer. And so that will inject new and additional information in fact that we don't even have right now. And the parties will need some time to incorporate and assimilate that.

But the Army Corps' work is limited; and in this case, it's different because it doesn't incorporate or focus on the agricultural uses in the Flint River Basin, which will have to then be combined with the uses for municipal and industrial and commercial purposes in metro Atlanta.

And that really brings me to my final point for supplementation, which is that while we are certainly committed to the expeditious moving forward of this case, as Mr. Kise said, this is not asking for time for time's sake. And we have been working quite well with counsel for Florida to figure out the best way to do this given the type of work both sides are going to have to do.

You know, these are significant public policy issues. The relief sought in this case will affect the municipal and commercial water use for millions of people in the metro THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

Atlanta region, and it could potentially affect in a significant way the agricultural use in the southern part of the state. And so Georgia, while committed to moving this forward, also wants to make sure that it has adequate time to do the hard work that needs to be done to demonstrate that its water use is completely appropriate and that equitable apportionment is not warranted. And to do that, we need to work with Florida and with all the various agencies throughout Georgia to get that data and make sure that our experts on both sides, and ultimately the Special Master and the Supreme Court have a full record that accounts for all of this. And that's really our principal motivation in coming to the Special Master and suggesting in the first instance that the parties just be given some time to really lock horns and engage on the types of information we both foresee this case involving and that we can answer the question that you initiated this conference with in a more detailed and substantive way, perhaps in late January. But short of that, just to put THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
down a marker and a request to say that some of these time lines, we think given the task at hand, are just too tight and, therefore, to ask the Special Master for some relief from the schedule.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you very much.

I appreciate your concern. I appreciate Florida's concern. And certainly I have no desire to move this matter so fast that the facts are not fully developed. But let me ask you, Georgia, when do you expect to file your answer?

MR. PRIMIS: At present, we were planning to do it on the deadline of February 2.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And that is my concern. For example, if $I$ am correct, you have had Florida's complaint for over a year. Is that not correct?

MR. PRIMIS: That's true.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And, yet, you still need until February 2 to draft and file an answer?

In my experience, an answer is fairly
THE REPORTING GROUP
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simple, admit, deny, or insufficient information to be able to frame a response. What am I missing?

MR. PRIMIS: Well, there are certainly some factual issues alleged in the complaint that we wanted to investigate so that we could provide an informed denial or indicate where we needed more information or just couldn't respond. I think from our perspective, the more important point from a scheduling perspective -- and I don't think Florida disagrees with this, although the Special Master can obviously inquire. But I don't think that the hard work of figuring out what the case is likely to involve in terms of data collection, document discovery, and -- and agency work on both sides is going to be driven principally by the content of the answer. I think that the case -- or at least the data work and expert work that Florida is doing is already known to them now; and $I$ don't believe much of what we say in the answer is going to change that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And I - MR. PRIMIS: So that's why we proposed, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
even in advance of the answer, to meet, confer, exchange information. And I believe Florida was willing to work with us on that.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Yes. You may
have misunderstood my question. Originally, the answer was due, $I$ think, on -- I have forgotten when it was due. But it was -well, it was originally scheduled to be answered on December 3, I think. And then Georgia filed on the 25 th and asked for a 60-day extension on September 25. And as a result of that, all of the deadlines got moved at least 60 days.

My question about when you're going to file the answer makes some difference in scheduling following the filing of the answer. For example, if you were prepared to file the answer tomorrow, $I$ don't think we need to continue to have some of the deadlines that were triggered by that running on into March.

So my question, again, is you will
recall that in the $C M O, I$ said that every effort should be made to complete each activity in advance of the prescribed THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
deadline. And $I$ intend to continue to beat that drum as we go forward.

Now, if you can't file the answer until the $2 n d$, why so be it. But $I$ urge you to take another look at it and see whether it isn't possible to file the answer, not because of the substance of the matter, but because of the deadlines that were triggered by that filing.

Let me ask another question. How many lawyers are there of record for Florida at this point?

MR. KISE: Your Honor, this is Mr. Kise again. Just so I'm -- let me just look just to be certain. There are quite a number.

I believe we have seven on the service list. And then -- eight -- I would say nine, your Honor, to be safe.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And who on Florida's behalf selected those lawyers who are participating?

MR. KISE: I believe it was the governor and the Attorney General. I'm -- I can -- I can speak for myself. And from what $I$ know historically, having been involved in these THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
matters for almost 12 years now, that that was the case, that the governor and Attorney General. And I don't think -- Mr. Winsor can state if it's any different. I think that's always been the case that it's been the governor and the Attorney General on the Florida side.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia, let me ask you the same two questions. How many lawyers and who selected them?

MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. For the State of Georgia at present there are three outside attorneys, myself, Mr. Allen, and Ms. Warren. And the two attorneys from the State are the Solicitor General Nels Peterson and special assistant to the Attorney General Britt Grant. And Seth Waxman as well is also listed.

In terms of who selected them, Mr. Peterson can correct me if $I^{\prime} m$ wrong; but I believe it was the Attorney General of Georgia and the Solicitor General of Georgia.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And I - -

MR. PETERSON: Your Honor, this is Nels Peterson with Georgia. It was the Attorney THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart

General in consultation with the governor, much like Florida.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And I assume that in both states in both instances that the selection was made based upon a judgment that they were competent trial lawyers, that they know how to draft pleadings, they know how to do discovery, and that they have enough lawyers to staff the case. Am I correct in those assumptions? Florida?

MR. WINSOR: Yes, your Honor.
This is Allen Winsor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And, Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: The reason
I'm asking these apparently unrelated
questions is because if you feel -- either state feels that you are understaffed, I urge you to take another look at it. As long as you feel you're staffed properly and you think that there is nothing that we haven't discussed here, I'm still puzzled by why Georgia can't file its answer before the $2 n d$; but $I$ won't press that question.

MR. PRIMIS: Your Honor, this is Craig
THE REPORTING GROUP
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Primis for Georgia.
I just would make two statements on that. First, immediately after this call we will confer with our client and see if we can move that up and address your Honor's question. And, second, I think evidenced primarily by our actions, but certainly also by our verbal commitment, that answer date has not in any way inhibited our effort to reach out to Florida, Florida's effort to reciprocate, and to all work together to start mapping out the discovery process even before the answer.

So while I appreciate the concern the Special Master has articulated and, as I said, we will confer with counsel for Georgia to address that, I did want to underscore that things are moving. The wheels are in motion regardless of what that date is.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And I
appreciate that. And as $I$ said before, $I$ am delighted that counsel are conferring and that counsel are trying to expedite the matter. However, the sooner you can get me an answer on that, the sooner $I$ can address THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
the deadlines. As you can appreciate, I'm not going to rule without some more thought on this.

But let me ask another question.
Recognizing that prior proceedings involved some different issues, did any of the lawyers now involved in this matter have any in-depth exposure to or involvement in the prior proceedings? Florida?

MR. KISE: Your Honor, this is Mr. Kise, again.

I certainly did, and on Florida's side Mr. Wilmoth and Mr. Blankenau. And I think we are the only three of the current group that have any in-depth experience, as you put it, in the prior matters.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PETERSON: Your Honor, this is Nels Peterson. I have been involved in these matters for about seven years. But on our team, that is probably the greatest length of time. Mr. Waxman has been involved for perhaps a couple of years, but that's about it.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Well, with THE REPORTING GROUP
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that experience, you certainly are all entitled and able to draw on that and distinguish what is necessarily additional information that you need. So I'm comfortable with where we are on that. You know, I just want to add that I think you will recall that these conferences are to be preceded by a progress report. And that's the reason that $I$ said that was because we're talking about prospective here. So that when we have our next conference, which is scheduled for -- currently scheduled for February 10 , but which may be moved because of the changes in the deadline and the filing of the answer, we'll begin with a progress report preceded -- an oral progress report preceded by a written progress report currently due on March 6, I think it is. And the reason for those is to see what has been done since the last conference so that I am able to judge whether, in fact, your meetings, your attempts at joint meetings, have been effective or not. And $I$ hope you understand the reason for those progress reports. Florida?

MR. KISE: Yes, your Honor. We certainly do.

This is Mr. Kise again.
And perhaps in advance of that date, depending on how our -- well, I don't want to qualify it. We are certainly, as we have told you, both sets of counsel, meeting and working together to try and, you know, get our arms around completely this undertaking. I don't want to leave it unsaid because Mr. Primis had mentioned this that we -- we agree in the main that the fact that we do not have an answer from the state of Georgia has not held us up in any way at all in terms of the tasks that we are now undertaking in terms of discovery. While certainly there may be some points that are raised there that would require alternate or additional thinking or discovery, there are things that we certainly know now. And it is that knowledge -- it is the knowledge borne -and, again, speaking for myself -- of a decade of involvement here that leads Florida to conclude that we need the time that we're suggesting to the Court because we know THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
what -- even without the conferences, we already know where we're headed in terms of volume and time for assimilation.

But we certainly could also provide to the Court, if it is your desire, at some point in January maybe even set another conference down for late January prior to the one that you have already scheduled, to update the Court on where we are and what we have learned and how we are moving because I think at that point, we will have a -certainly a more developed understanding than we're able to present to the Court.

I'm not certain -- and $I$ don't want to hazard a guess as to what that might do to our thoughts on the schedule, but $I$ certainly think we would be in a much better position towards the end of January after we have had this opportunity to provide a written report to the Court and to also have another conference at your -- you know, certainly at your discretion.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you for that.

Let me ask counsel for both states THE REPORTING GROUP
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whether there have been any settlement discussions? Florida?

MR. KISE: Your Honor, this is Mr. Kise for Florida.

If you mean since the filing of this
action, the answer would be no. Since roughly October, September of '13, no. The last settlement discussion that $I$ can recall participating in -- and Mr. Peterson might have a recollection of this that's the same or different -- would have been that summer, would have been May, June, July of '13-- of 2013 is my best recollection would have been the last discussions.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?

MR. PRIMIS: I would not disagree with that recollection, your Honor.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: If I'm correct, in April of this year, Georgia Governor Deal was quoted as saying that settlement is possible because, quote, we're very close to a deal. No pun intended, gentlemen.

And then in November, towards the end of November, Georgia Attorney General Olens said THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
that all three governors should sit down again to try and solve the problem because settlement possibilities were not Herculean or Herculean.

So is there any prospect of counsel sitting down or the governors sitting down going forward and discussing settlement?

MR. KISE: Your Honor, Mr. Kise for Florida.

Certainly that's something we can take back to our client, the governor and the Attorney General, to make that determination. I don't want to answer your question without having an opportunity to check.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Right. I understand. Georgia?

MR. PETERSON: Your Honor, this is Nels
Peterson. And I'm mindful that this
transcript will potentially be publicly available; and so $I$ have to be, you know, careful in the way that $I$ phrase this. I think there is certainly an openness on Georgia's part; but that is driven and decided by people well senior to anyone on this call.

THE REPORTING GROUP
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SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Right. Let me make this suggestion, which you can take back to your superiors for whatever it's worth. Assume with me for the moment that the Corps had completed its updating of its operating manual. Assume with me that the pleadings, the complaint and the answer, to be filed had been admitted. Assume that all discovery was complete and assume that everything at that juncture was exactly as it is now. Is there any reason that you could not -- the states could not agree to settle it with an escape clause in the settlement agreement which provided that if the information on which the settlement was based was erroneous in any way, either or both states could withdraw?

That's just a suggestion. I don't require a comment at this point. You can take that back or not as you see fit.

And I think with that, unless you have something else to add, gentlemen, Josh and $I$ will confer, review the transcript which Claudette will, as usual, get out promptly, and get back to you with our ruling on where THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
we stand on deadlines.
Anything else, Florida?
MR. KISE: No, your Honor.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.
MR. PETERSON: Nels Peterson for Georgia.

One just observation in terms of the amount of work to be done, we have full faith in the ability of the lawyers involved to staff up and handle any -- any task. Our concern is not simply a litigation concern, it is also a management concern in terms of all of the third parties that will need to provide data and documents in a timely fashion. And so some of our concern is about things that are not wholly within our authority, and simply wanted to flag that for you.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: When you say not within your authority, you mean the State has no authority over its agencies?

MR. PETERSON: The State has authority
over its agencies, but there are many
entities that are not state agencies that THE REPORTING GROUP
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will have very relevant data that we do not have the authority to direct.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Give me an example.

MR. PETERSON: Every county in Georgia is a separate legal entity that we do not have the authority to direct. So that would be an example.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Is there anything else? Florida?
MR. KISE: Your Honor, Mr. Kise again.
Just to maybe not make too fine a point on what Mr. Peterson just said, but just to give the Court some perspective -- and I may have mentioned this before, just his point about not authority over counties, we know now there are at least 19 or 20 separate counties just in the greater metropolitan Atlanta region that, as $I$ mentioned, rely on in some shape, form, or fashion water supply and will have input, not to mention the myriad counties that will be extant along the Flint River.

So if they don't have authority -- and this is something we're learning obviously, THE REPORTING GROUP Mason \& Lockhart
and we'll need to work with them on -- that could present a -- a fairly significant challenge.

SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
Anything else, gentlemen?
MR. PRIMIS: No, sir.
SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: One more point, one final point which $I$ will continue to repeat as we go forward. If anything, this conference call underscores the increasingly large cost of this transaction. I urge you, again, to consider settlement.

Thank you all.
MR. KISE: Thank you.
MR. WINSOR: Thank you.
MR. PRIMIS: Thank you.
(The telephone conference was concluded at 10:45 a.m.)

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart

CERTIFICATE
I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public
in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify
that the foregoing pages are a correct
transcript of my stenographic notes of the above-captioned proceedings.

I further certify that $I$ am a disinterested person in the event or outcome of the above-named cause of action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I subscribe my hand this 15 th day of December, 2014.

My Commission Expires
June 9, 2019.

THE REPORTING GROUP
Mason \& Lockhart


| ```1:11 comment [1] - 34:19 commercial [2] - 19:12, 19:24 Commercial [1] - 1:10 Commission [1] - 38:18 commitment [1] - 27:8 committed [2] - 19:15, 20:4 competent [1]-26:6 complaint [3] - 21:19, 22:5, 34:7 complete [4] - 9:23, 18:1, 23:24, 34:9 completed [1] - 34:5 completely [2] - 20:8, 30:9 completion [1]-7:19 complexities [2] - 4:17, 4:21 compliance [1] - 15:11 complicating[1] - 18:23 comprised [1] - 14:7 concern [8] -21:8, 21:9, 21:18, 27:14, 35:12, 35:13, 35:16 conclude [1] - 30:24 concluded [1] - 37:17 confer[4]-23:2, 27:4, 27:16, 34:23 conference [9]-4:1, 8:7, 20:23, 29:11, 29:20, 31:7, 31:21, 37:10, 37:17 CONFERENCE [1] - 1:8 conferences [3] - 3:11, 29:7, 31:1 conferred [1] - 16:20 conferring [1] - 27:22 conservation [1] - 14:17 consider [1] - 37:12 considered [1] - 9:20 consist [1] - 14:9 constituents [1] - 17:7 consultation [1] - 26:1 consumption [1] - 7:7 consumptive [1] -``` | ```14:13 content \({ }_{[1]}-22: 18\) context [3]-11:12, 11:20, 14:20 continue [3]-23:19, 24:1, 37:8 conversations [4] - 5:15, 5:20, 8:16, 8:17 cooperatively [1] - 18:2 coordinating [1] - 8:11 Corps [12]-11:3, 11:4, 11:22, 12:22, 13:7, 14:4, 15:5, 15:10, 18:17, 18:22, 18:24, 34:5 Corps' [4]-12:1, 13:2, 13:12, 19:6 correct [6]-21:18, 21:20, 25:20, 26:10, 32:19, 38:4 correctly [1] - 10:15 cost [1] - 37:11 counsel [14]-2:3, 4:8, 5:1, 8:18, 10:5, 16:4, 16:12, 19:19, 27:16, 27:22, 27:23, 30:7, 31:25, 33:5 counterintuitive [1] - 10:21 counties [4]-6:25, 36:16, 36:18, 36:22 county \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(36: 5\) couple [2]-13:17, 28:23 course [1]-13:17 Court [15]-5:11, 6:10, 6:16, 6:23, 7:17, 12:4, 12:7, 16:6, 20:14, 30:25, 31:5, 31:9, 31:13, 31:20, 36:14 COURT [1]-1:1 Craig [2]-2:16, 26:25 CRAIG [1] - 1:18 CRR [1] - 1:12 current [2]-13:20, 28:14``` <br> D <br> data [11] - 11:18, 14:10, 14:11, 16:24, 17:5, 18:17, 20:12, 22:16, 22:20, 35:15, 36:1 date $[8]-5: 21,6: 12$, TH | ```9:6, 9:13, 9:16, 27:8, 27:19, 30:4 dated [1]-13:23 days [1]-23:13 deadline [3]-21:15, 24:1, 29:14 deadlines [5] - 23:12, 23:20, 24:8, 28:1, 35:1 Deal [1] - 32:20 deal [1]-32:22 dealt [2] - 15:2 debated [1]-11:1 decade [1] - 30:23 decades [1] - 13:17 December [3] - 1:11, 23:9, 38:11 decided [1] - 33:24 declaration [4] - 6:20, 6:23, 13:24 Defendants [1]-1:7 delays [1] - 4:22 delighted [1] - 27:22 demonstrate [2] - 8:8, 20:7 demonstrating [1] - 12:15 denial [1] - 22:7 deny [1]-22:1 Department [4] - 2:13, 3:3, 11:23, 11:24 dependent [1] - 7:4 depth [3]-4:16, 28:7, 28:15 desire [2]-21:10, 31:5 detail [5]-6:2, 8:14, 10:5, 10:9, 17:4 detailed [1] - 20:24 determination [1] - 33:12 develop [2]-6:3, 16:6 developed [4] - 9:24, 18:13, 21:11, 31:12 development [1] - 12:8 difference [1] - 23:15 different [9]-15:15, 16:18, 17:13, 17:14, 19:7, 25:4, 28:6, 32:11 dig [1] - 17:16 diligent [1]-8:10 direct [2] - 36:2, 36:7 directed [1] - 15:7 direction [5] - 8:5, 12:12, 14:5, 15:18, REPORTING``` | $\qquad$ <br> 16:5 <br> directly [1] - 11:9 <br> director [1] - 6:21 <br> disagree [2] - 18:4, <br> 32:16 <br> disagreement [1] 18:20 <br> disagrees [1] - 22:12 <br> discovery [13] - 5:17, <br> 7:19, 9:12, 11:7, <br> 14:10, 14:11, 18:8, <br> 22:16, 26:8, 27:12, <br> 30:16, 30:19, $34: 9$ <br> discretion [1] - 31:22 <br> discussed [1] - <br> 26:22 <br> discussing [1] - 33:7 <br> discussion [2] - <br> 7:23, 32:8 <br> discussions [6] - <br> 10:4, 11:12, 11:15, <br> 11:21, 32:2, 32:14 <br> disinterested [1] - <br> 38:8 <br> dispute [1]-10:22 <br> distinguish [1]-29:3 <br> distribute [2] - 13:8, 13:9 <br> distribution [1] 12:5 <br> document ${ }_{[1]}$ - 22:16 <br> documents [1] - <br> 35:15 <br> done [7]-8:9, 9:19, <br> 18:11, 18:18, 20:7, <br> 29:20, 35:9 <br> down [10]-6:1, 7:10, <br> 10:6, 10:8, 18:3, 21:1, <br> 31:7, 33:1, $33: 6$ <br> downstream [1] - <br> 13:12 <br> draft [2]-21:23, 26:7 <br> draw [1]-29:2 <br> driven [2]-22:18, <br> 33:23 <br> drum [1]-24:2 <br> DUBOIS [2]-1:22, <br> Dubois [2] - 3:5, 3:9 <br> due [3]-23:6, 23:7, <br> 29:18 <br> DUNLAP [1] - 1:23 <br> E | ```27:9, 27:10 eight [1] - 24:17 either [3]-15:24, 26:17, 34:16 Ellis [1] - 2:17 encompassed [1] - 7:1 encountered [1] - 15:23 end [2] - 31:18, 32:24 Endangered [1] - 15:10 engage [2] - 15:5, 20:20 engaged [2] - 9:9, 9:11 engaging [1] - 16:21 Engineers [2] - 11:22, 12:22 Engineers' [1] - 11:4 entities [3] - 7:5, 10:1, 35:25 entitled [1] - 29:2 entity [1] - 36:6 Environmental [1] - 2:13 EPD [1] - 6:21 equitable [2]-12:5, 20:8 erroneous [1] - 34:16 escape [1] - 34:13 ESQ[12] - 1:15, 1:16, 1:16, 1:17, 1:18, 1:19, 1:19, 1:20, 1:20, 1:21, 1:22, 1:23 estimates [2]-5:23, 5:24 et [2] - 4:20 evaporation [1] - 14:17 event [1] - 38:8 evidenced [1] - 27:6 exactly [1] - 34:10 example [5] - 9:2, 21:18, 23:17, 36:4, 36:8 exception [1]-12:11 exchange [3] - 11:17, 14:23, 23:2 exchanged [1] - 14:10 exchanges [2] - 11:10, 13:21 exercise [1] - 16:3 exist [1] - 17:9 exists [3] - 10:18, 14:2, 17:9``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| xpect $[1]-21: 12$ | $\text { fit }[1]-34: 20$ | gentlemen [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:25 } \\ & \text { hit }[1]-5: 2 \\ & \text { Honor }[37]-2: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 11:10, 12:20, 13:16, 13:21, 14:6, 14:14, 14:21, 17:4, 17:10, 17:17, 18:6, 18:23, 19:2, 20:21, 22:2, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| expedite [1]-27:23 | five $[1]-11: 19$ <br> flag $[1]-35: 18$ <br> Flint [3] - 7:10, 19:9, | 32:23, 34:22, 37:5 <br> GEORGIA ${ }_{[1]}-1: 6$ <br> Georgia [31] - 1:18, |  |  |
| expeditious [1] |  |  |  |  |
| 19:16 expeditiously [3] |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Georgia }[31]-1: 18, \\ 2: 15,2: 21,3: 23,6: 21, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Honor }[37]-2: 9, \\ 2: 13,2: 16,2: 20,3: 1, \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 12:14, 16:17, 16:19 | FLORIDA [1] - 1:3 <br> Florida [30] - 1:15, | 8:18, 10:5, 13:11, <br> 16:9, 20:4, 20:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 13,2: 16,2: 20,3: 1, \\ & 3: 6,3: 13,3: 22,3: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 8,23: 2,29: 4, \\ & 34: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| exp |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 6,4: 25,5: 4,5: 18, \\ & 9: 4,9: 14,10: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 21:25, 28:15, 29:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:8, 2:10, 3:20, 4:24, } \\ & 5: 1,13: 6,15: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 16:9, 20:4, 20:11, } \\ \text { 21:12, 23:10, 25:8, } \end{array}$ |  | informed [1] - 22:7 <br> inhibited [1] - 27:9 |
| expert [3]-6:8, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 12,25: 22,25: 25, \\ & 26: 13,26: 23,27: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 10:25, 12:6, 12:24, |  |
| 18:10, 22:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 1,13: 6,15: 16 \\ & \text { 16:10, 16:13, 17:18, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 16:11, 24:13, 24:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { initial }[2]-7: 22, \\ & 16: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| experts [8]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:21, 19:19, 20:10, } \\ & 22: 12,22: 21,23: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 16,28: 17,30: 13 \\ & 32: 15,32: 19,32: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 11,25: 24,26: 11, \\ & 26: 14,26: 25,28: 10, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 7 |  |  |  | initiated [1] - 20:23 |
| 15:6, 18:16, 20:13 | 24:11, 25:7, 26:2, | 33:16, 35:4, 35:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 18,30: 1,32: 3, \\ & 32: 17,33: 8,33: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { inject }[1]-19: 2 \\ & \text { input }[1]-36: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| Expires [1] - 38 | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 10,27: 10,28: 9, \\ & 29: 25,30: 23,32: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 36:5 |  |  |
| ex |  |  | 35:3, 35:5, 36:1 | input [1] - 36:21 inquire [1]-22:13 instance [2]-7:22 |
| exposure [1] -28:8 | 32:4, 33:9, 35:2 | 14:12, 14:13, 17:12 | Honor's [1]-27 |  |
| extant ${ }_{[1]}-36: 22$ | 36:10 <br> Florida's [8] - 6:11, | given [5] - 10:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:23 } \\ & \text { hopefully [5] - 5:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:18 } \\ & \text { instances }[1]-26: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| extensions [1]-4:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:8, 14:12, 21:9, } \\ & \text { 21:19, 24:20, 27:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:3, 19:20, 20:19, } \\ & 21: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | instances [1]-26:4 insufficient [1] - 22:1 |
| eye [2]-18:7 |  | glean [1] - 6:14 | hopefully [5] - $5: 12$, 8:8, 8:22, 12:14, 16:2 | insufficient [1]-22:1 <br> intend [1] - 24:1 <br> intended [1]-32:22 |
| F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { flow }[1]-13: 12 \\ & \text { focus }[1]-19: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 11$ <br> governor [5]-24:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7:6 } \\ & \text { hydrology }[1]-4: 19 \end{aligned}$ | intended [1] - 32:22 <br> intent [2]-3:18, |
| fact [4]-7:19, 19:3, | ks [1] - 5:20 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:23 } \\ & \text { interested }[1]-15: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:21, } 30: 12 \\ & \text { factor }[1]-18: 24 \end{aligned}$ | foregoing [1] - 38:4 | 33:11 |  | ```internally [1] - 5:20 interpretation [1] - 15:3``` |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { foresee }[3]-17: 5 \text {, } \\ & 17: 12,20: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 33:6 |  |  |
| 21:11 <br> factual [1] - 22:5 <br> fair [1] - 12:5 <br> fairly [2]-21:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:12, 20:21 } \\ & \text { forgotten }[1]-23: 7 \\ & \text { form }[2]-7: 3,36: 20 \\ & \text { format }_{[1]}-17: 10 \end{aligned}$ | ```33:6 GRANT[1]-1:20 Grant [2] - 2:23, 25:17``` | immediately [1] 27:3 important [2] - 18:8, | investigate ${ }_{[1]}-22: 6$ <br> invitation [1] - 4:12 <br> involve [4]-5:23, <br> 11:16, 11:17, 22:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 2 \\ & \text { faith }{ }_{[1]}-35: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forth }[1]-6: 21 \\ & \text { forward }[12]-5: 16 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | GRAY $[4]-1: 21,3: 1$, | importantly [1] - 5:9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { involved }[8]-4: 18, \\ 6: 5,24: 25,28: 5,28: 7, \end{gathered}$ |
| far [1]-6:1 <br> fashion [3]-7:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 15,15: 19,15: 21, \\ & 16: 16,16: 18,17: 23, \end{aligned}$ | Gray [1] - 3 : | $\begin{aligned} & \text { impression }[2]-5: 5 \text {, } \\ & \text { 13:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 28:19, 28:22, $35: 10$ involvement [2] - |
| $35: 16,36: 20$ | $19: 16,20: 5,24: 2$ | great [1] - 10:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:16 } \\ & \mathbf{I N}_{[1]}-38: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:8, 30:23 } \\ & \text { involving [2] - 12:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| February [4]-17:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 7,37: 9 \\ & \text { four }[1]-16: 21 \end{aligned}$ | greater [1] - 36:18 <br> greatest [1] - 28:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:7, 28:15 } \\ & \text { inadmissible }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 21:16, 21:23, 29:13 } \\ \text { federal }[5]-14: 8, \end{gathered}$ | frame [1]-22:2 | group [1] - 28:14 <br> guess [1] - 31:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:11 } \\ & \text { inappropriate }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | issue [2]-13:6, 13:8 issues [12]-4:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:11 } \\ & \text { figure }[1]-19: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { full }[2]-20: 15,35: 9 \\ & \text { fully }[1]-21: 11 \end{aligned}$ | H | 13:14 <br> include [1] - 4:19 <br> incorporate [5] - 5:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 1,14: 18,15: 3 \\ & 17: 16,18: 13,19: 23 \\ & 22: 5,28: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| figuring $[2]-17: 8$, 22:14 |  |  | $6: 7,7: 16,19: 5,19: 8$ <br> increasingly [1] - |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { file [8]-3:17, 21:12, } \\ \text { 21:23, 23:15, 23:18, } \end{gathered}$ |  | 38:10 |  |  |
| filed [3] - 4:2, 23:10, | gathering [4]-7:14, | appy [1] - $3: 1$ | 6:15 | JAMES ${ }_{[1]}-1: 22$ |
| $34: 8$ | 9:21, 10:12, 14:21 <br> General [10]-24:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hard }[3]-17: 8,20: 6, \\ & 22: 14 \end{aligned}$ | indicators [1] - 14:4 | January [7] -9:13, 9:16, 13:25, 20:25, |
| 11:8, 23:16, 24:9, | 25:3, 25:6, 25:15, | 22:14 |  | 31:6, 31:7, 31:18Jim [1] - 3:5 |
| 29:15, 32:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 16,25: 21,25: 22, \\ & 26: 1,32: 25,33: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { headed }[1]-31: 2$ | industrial [2]-13:10, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { filings }[1]-15: 8 \\ & \text { final }[2]-19: 13,37: 8 \end{aligned}$ | General's [1] - 2:21 | held [2] - 1:9, 30:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { informal [2]-11:10, } \\ & \text { 11:11 } \end{aligned}$ | job [1] - 9:19 <br> joint [2] - 4:10, 29:22 |
| $\text { e }[1]-36: 12$ |  | 12:23, 13:18 <br> Herculean [2]-33:3, | information [33] - | Josh [3]-2:5, 4:15, |
| rst [7] - 2:8, 4:9, | generally [1] - 6:19 <br> generated [1]-12:20 |  | $7: 7,8: 2,9: 25,10: 1 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 34:22 } \\ & \text { JOSHUA }_{[1]}-1: 23 \\ & \text { judge }_{[1]}-29: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1, 8:4, 8:6, 20:18, | generating [1] - | 33 |  |  |
| $27: 3$ | THE | hereby [1] - 38:3 <br> REPORTING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:9, 10:10, 10:18, } \\ & \text { ROUP } \end{aligned}$ |  |



Mason \& Lockhart



| $\mathbf{Y}$ |
| :---: |
| year $[2]-21: 20$, |
| 32:19 |
| years $[8]-10: 24$, |
| 11:14, 11:16, 11:20, |
| 13:23, 25:1, 28:20, |
| 28:23 |
|  |

