Fl v. GA

	Telephone Cor	iterence - 12	
No. STATE OF FLORIDA, Plaintif V. STATE OF GEORGIA, Defendan TELEPHONE CON RALPH I. LANCASTER, Atwood, LLP, at Merr Portland, Maine, on 10:00 a.m., before C	1 RT OF THE UNITED STATES 142, Original f,) f,) f,) b FERENCE before SPECIAL MASTER held at the law offices of Pierce ill's Wharf, 254 Commercial Street, December 8, 2015, commercing at laudette G. Mason, RMR, CRR, a for the State of Maine. rida: PHILIP J. PERRY, ESQ. ALLEN C. WINSOR, ESQ. OSVALDO VAZQUEZ, ESQ.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	3 from Kirkland & Ellis, LLP, for the State of Georgia. I also have with me my colleague Devora Allon. MS. GRANT: And, good morning, your Honor. Britt Grant is also on the line from Georgia. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Mr. Allen, will you be the spokesperson for Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: This is Craig Primis. I'll be the spokesperson for Georgia. And just to clear up any confusion, we have two people with the last name Allen on our team. I believe you may be referring to Winn Allen, who has spoken in the past. This is an unrelated person named Devora Allon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you, Mr. Primis, for clarifying that. United States? MR. GRAY: Yes, your Honor. Good morning, your Honor. This is Michael Gray for the United States.
	ORTING GROUP & Lockhart	23 24 25	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Gray, having looked at the progress reports, I don't think there is anything that will call THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart
 4 counsel. 5 MR. PERRY: Go 6 SPECIAL MASTE 7 usual suspects here 8 manager; Mary Cliff 9 and the incomparab 10 reporter. 11 Let's start again 12 please. Florida? 13 MR. PERRY: Ph 14 Honor. 15 MR. WINSOR: MARKER 16 Allen Winsor. I'm o 17 SPECIAL MASTE 18 for Florida? 19 MR. VAZQUEZ: 20 is Os Vazquez from 21 SPECIAL MASTE 22 will you be the spok 23 MR. PERRY: I w 	R LANCASTER: Good morning, od morning, your Honor. R LANCASTER: We have the , Josh Dunlap, the case ord, the legal assistant; le Claudette Mason, our with appearances, il Perry for Florida, your Good morning. This is n the line as well. R LANCASTER: Anyone else Good morning, sir. This Florida as well. R LANCASTER: Mr. Perry, esperson today? vill, your Honor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 21	for your comments; but you should feel free to jump in if there is anything that is subject to your thoughts or comments. And let me say on an ongoing basis I won't repeat this again but you should understand that that invitation stands at each conference. Clear? MR. GRAY: Yes. Thank you very much. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let's start, if we may, with my favorite this will be no surprise the mediation and settlement sections of your progress reports. Let me remind you that whatever you do, whatever you say will be part of a transcript. So you should be circumspect in responding to my questions. First, both progress reports indicated that you have begun the mediation discussion. I'm not clear, however, exactly what is going on. When is the last time that you met or discussed mediation? Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe it was
	ckhart	24 25	last week. And Mr. Primis and I have been having that discussion, and we have been in THE REPORTING GROUP Mason & Lockhart The Reporting Group (207) 797-6

	5		7
1	the process of arranging for all the	1	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
2	logistics that are required for a	2	MR. PRIMIS: Yes, we're ready to talk
3	confidential mediation process, including the	3	whenever Mr. Perry finishes with his due
4	selection of the mediator.	4	diligence. So certainly this week would be
5	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia, do	5	acceptable to us. And from our perspective,
6	you agree?	6	the sooner the better.
7	MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor Craig	7	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Will the
8	Primis I do agree.	8	decision on a mediator be done by outside
9	To put a little more color on that, the	9	lawyers or by consensus process, or how is it
	parties agreed shortly after the call last	-	
10		10	working, Florida?
11	month to exchange proposed mediator names. I	11	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, my sense is that
12	am mindful of your Honor's comments at the	12	it may well be by a consensus process. Right
13	beginning. I won't identify who we	13	now, without disclosing any of the details,
14	identified to each other, but we did exchange	14	there is a potential that we could agree on
15	names. And both sides have had an	15	an individual that both entities, both states
16	opportunity to evaluate whether the people on	16	know of and are familiar with. And so that
17	those lists would be appropriate.	17	was, I think, what Mr. Primis was describing
18	They were all reputable attorneys. So	18	a moment ago. And so that's a good
19	in our view it was a good faith exchange of	19	development, and we're working on that now.
20	names. And we're trying to come to ground on	20	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
21	selecting one of those people. That was the	21	MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. The
22	conversation that Mr. Perry and I had last	22	the assumption that Georgia has been
23	week.	23	proceeding on, I think it's been explicitly
24	I believe he was going to take some	24	stated between the parties, is that the
25	steps this week to further evaluate one of	25	agreed mediator would be somebody acceptable
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	0		0
	6		8
1	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to	1	not only to outside counsel, but also to the
2	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that.	2	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because
2 3	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it	2 3	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both
2 3 4	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather	2 3 4	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and
2 3 4 5	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr	2 3 4 5	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator.
2 3 4 5 6	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection	2 3 4 5 6	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a
2 3 4 5 6 7	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been	2 3 4 5 6 7	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida. Mr. Primis is correct that we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should be one person on each side; and it should be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida. Mr. Primis is correct that we are engaged in an effort to make progress in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should be one person on each side; and it should be one of in my opinion it should be one of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida. Mr. Primis is correct that we are engaged in an effort to make progress in the mediator selection, and we hope that we'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should be one person on each side; and it should be one of in my opinion it should be one of the outside lawyers who has the authority to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida. Mr. Primis is correct that we are engaged in an effort to make progress in the mediator selection, and we hope that we'll have another discussion on that topic with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should be one person on each side; and it should be one of in my opinion it should be one of the outside lawyers who has the authority to make that decision. Otherwise, you're never
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida. Mr. Primis is correct that we are engaged in an effort to make progress in the mediator selection, and we hope that we'll have another discussion on that topic with Georgia by the end of this week.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should be one person on each side; and it should be one of in my opinion it should be one of the outside lawyers who has the authority to make that decision. Otherwise, you're never going to get there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the candidates, and Georgia stands ready to move expeditiously once he's done that. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: I take it then that this is by phone conference rather than in person, Mr MR. PRIMIS: Yes. In terms of selection of a mediator and logistics, we have been doing that by phone conference. I think once we have a mediator selected, I'm just anticipating that at that point we'll all agree that it will be important to the process to get key people meeting in person. But at this point, just for efficiency purposes, we're moving through with telephone conferences. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: And when will the next discussion of mediation take place, Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Phil Perry for Florida. Mr. Primis is correct that we are engaged in an effort to make progress in the mediator selection, and we hope that we'll have another discussion on that topic with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not only to outside counsel, but also to the decision makers within the states because it's important for there to be buy-in both among clients and counsel for the process and for the mediator. And so we have been driving towards a voluntary and consensual selection process, which appears to be moving fairly quickly, and, hopefully, will be resolved soon. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: You said lead mediator? MR. PRIMIS: No. I there would just be one mediator. I'm sorry if I said that. Maybe I meant lead to a mediator, but we are only focusing on and aiming to select one. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Let me just suggest that a consensus decision, that is a decision by the outside lawyers and representatives of the states and God knows who else, is doomed to failure. There should be one person on each side; and it should be one of in my opinion it should be one of the outside lawyers who has the authority to make that decision. Otherwise, you're never

	9		11
1	Now, that's just my comment; but I'm	1	get an overview of the case, the issues that
2	going to suggest to you that you because	2	are centrally in dispute, and then get that
3	you are experienced, talented lawyers that	3	person's take on the best way forward,
4	you suggest to your state clients that they	4	obviously with input from the parties given
5	delegate the authority to select the mediator	5	our superior knowledge of the facts of the
6	to you. You can obtain whatever information	6	case at this point.
7	they want to give you; but in the end, you	7	But that would be the recommended first
8	make the decision.	8	step. And I think we would want to secure
9	That's just a suggestion. I have no	9	time with the mediator at the mediator's
10	power to order you to do that, and I wouldn't	10	earliest convenience.
11	do it anyway. But I suggest from my	11	And these are usually busy people, so it
12	experience as an independent counsel that if	12	might take a bit of time to get that person
13	you try to do things by consensus, you're	13	up to speed and to get on their calendar, but
14	doomed to failure.	14	move it forward quickly and assess where it's
15	Well, I would hope I'm very pleased	15	heading and how the mediator can keep the
16	that you have begun making progress on the	16	process moving forward.
17	mediation. And I'm hopeful that you will get	17	We would be open to discussing an end
18	to the decision very quickly.	18	point for it, but in my experience these
19	Do you intend to set a time limit for	19	sometimes evolve organically and are very
20	the mediation to conclude, Florida?	20	iterative processes. And while time pressure
21	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, we would like to	21	would be good to keep people focused, we
22	speak with the mediator in a little more	22	wouldn't want it to become an impediment if
23	detail on our options for format and process.	23	progress is being made in the interim.
24	It may be that we want to approach this in a	24	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Two things,
25	way that allows us to initially mediate a	25	and then we'll switch to something else.
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	10		10
			12
1	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to	1	First, feel free to share with your clients
2	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road	2	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to
2 3	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions	2 3	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by
2 3 4	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way	2 3 4	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that
2 3 4 5	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success,	2 3 4 5	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the
2 3 4 5 6	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a
2 3 4 5 6 7	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and	2 3 4 5 6 7	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all experienced and have their own developed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida? MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. We have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all experienced and have their own developed methodologies for going about doing this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all experienced and have their own developed methodologies for going about doing this. So I think the first step and this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida? MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. We have attempted to only seek documents that we think are critical to our case for trial.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all experienced and have their own developed methodologies for going about doing this. So I think the first step and this should happen rapidly would be for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida? MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. We have attempted to only seek documents that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all experienced and have their own developed methodologies for going about doing this. So I think the first step and this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida? MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. We have attempted to only seek documents that we think are critical to our case for trial. And after your order ordered the production
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	couple of the core issues fairly quickly to see where we get and see if there's a road forward and then schedule further sessions thereafter. But we want to do it in a way that maximizes the potential for success, your Honor. And so we appreciate your suggestion and your comments very much, and for our part or for Florida's part we are trying to find a way to maximize the potential success by arranging a process that allows us the flexibility to move quickly, but also recognizes the complexity involved. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: Yes. I think we agree with one part of what Mr. Perry said, which is that it's important to get the mediator's suggestions and input on logistics. We intend to be very flexible, and the mediators that we have exchanged by name are all experienced and have their own developed methodologies for going about doing this. So I think the first step and this should happen rapidly would be for the parties to get together with the mediator,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	First, feel free to share with your clients my suggestions as to giving you authority to make these decisions rather than doing it by consensus. And, secondly, I anticipate that the next status report will reflect that the parties have agreed to a mediator and a timing for the mediation. Any questions about that? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia Florida? MR. PERRY: No. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right. Then, let's turn to other issues which have been raised in the progress report. Florida has said that it is continuing to seek documents by subpoena of various professors at the Georgia universities. Do the parties have anything to add to that? Florida? MR. PERRY: Yes, your Honor. We have attempted to only seek documents that we think are critical to our case for trial. And after your order ordered the production of Dr. Kistenmacher's e-mails a few weeks

Г

	Telephone Con	ference	
	13		15
1	ago, we have, of course, spent a lot of time	1	And, in fact, what we have also learned
2	with that; and we have continued his	2	from the Kistenmacher e-mails is that these
3	deposition. And that has taught us quite a	3	Georgakakos e-mails will not only be relevant
4	bit about the case.	4	to Dr. Georgakakos's deposition, but there
-		-	are communications in those e-mails to a
5	Those e-mails are invaluable to us, and	5	
6	we have been able also to very specifically	6	whole range of people that we are seeking to
7	tailor the additional e-mails we will need.	7	depose. And those e-mails address a great
8	And we have only identified three professors	8	range of issues that we believe are relevant
9	from Georgia universities that have e-mails	9	to this case.
10	that we would like to pursue. One is a	10	When we first talked about the
11	gentleman named Dr. Georgakakos, who is the	11	Dr. Kistenmacher e-mails, I made a comment
12	supervisor of Dr. Kistenmacher. And we have	12	that the documents we received prior to that
13	offered search terms to Georgia for	13	point were essentially an unassembled
14	Dr. Kistenmacher focused on the same very	14	automobile engine, parts in a box with no
15	specific issues we think will help us with	15	explanation how to reassemble them. The
16	this case.	16	e-mails have shown us exactly what the
17	Dr. Georgakakos is the director of an	17	relevance was of all those documents.
18	entity that advertises itself as in close	18	It has been an incredibly helpful
19	partnership with the Georgia State	19	exercise to read them, and we're confident
20	Environmental Protection Division on	20	that we will have the same reaction to the
21	hydrology issues and integrally involved in	21	e-mails for Dr. Georgakakos.
22	Georgia state water planning. And so our	22	The other two individuals for whom we're
23	search terms were very narrowly confined to	23	seeking e-mails are Dr. Mark Masters from
23	those issues that we think will yield fruit	23	Albany State University. And he is relevant
	-		
25	for us.	25	as the director of the Georgia Water Planning
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	14		16
1	14 We understand from Georgia that they	1	16 and Policy Center, which is focused very
1		1	-
	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different		and Policy Center, which is focused very
2	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first	2	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other
2 3	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account	2 3	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a
2 3 4 5	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search	2 3 4 5	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia
2 3 4 5 6	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail	2 3 4 5 6	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor.
2 3 4 5 6 7	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about	2 3 4 5 6 7	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the Georgia Tech e-mail inbox, we think that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for Dr. Hook.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the Georgia Tech e-mail inbox, we think that's probably a reasonable production for them to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for Dr. Hook. But, again, all of these e-mails are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the Georgia Tech e-mail inbox, we think that's probably a reasonable production for them to make, not an incredible burden to produce	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for Dr. Hook. But, again, all of these e-mails are important to a whole range of our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the Georgia Tech e-mail inbox, we think that's probably a reasonable production for them to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for Dr. Hook. But, again, all of these e-mails are important to a whole range of our depositions. So that's why we're pursuing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the Georgia Tech e-mail inbox, we think that's probably a reasonable production for them to make, not an incredible burden to produce	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for Dr. Hook. But, again, all of these e-mails are important to a whole range of our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We understand from Georgia that they have run those search terms for two different accounts for Dr. Georgakakos. The first account is his account his e-mail account for Georgia Tech University. And our search terms narrowed the field to of his e-mail inbox to a subset which I understand is about 3,000 e-mails. The second e-mail inbox he has is one he has used with Dr. Kistenmacher. We know this, of course, because we have the Kistenmacher e-mails now. I won't identify the e-mail address, but we have several dozen e-mails from Dr. Georgakakos's private e-mail address. And so we're aware that he does a good portion of his business from that address. We are still waiting to hear from Georgia on what the search results were for that e-mail inbox. And if the numbers are similar to the numbers we got from the Georgia Tech e-mail inbox, we think that's probably a reasonable production for them to make, not an incredible burden to produce those e-mails.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and Policy Center, which is focused very specifically on agricultural water use in the Flint River Basin in particular. The other is Dr. James Hook, who is retired, but has a similar focus. He's a University of Georgia professor. Again, we would like to depose both of them soon. Dr. Mark Masters is January 6 to 7. And so we are putting some premium o speed here. We recently heard back from Georgia as to the scope of our search terms for Dr. Masters, and they appropriately pointed out that our search terms were too broad for him. So we are going to very soon, and probably this afternoon, change our search terms to much more narrowly define what we need from him. So we reduced their burden and focused more specifically on what's likely to be important. And we will do the same for Dr. Hook. But, again, all of these e-mails are important to a whole range of our depositions. So that's why we're pursuing

FI	۷.	GA

	Telephone Con	ference	
	17	1	19
1	them.	1	And assuming that it results in a reasonable
2	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?	2	number to review and produce, we will go
3	MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. Craig	3	ahead and do that.
4	Primis for Georgia.	4	So we're being responsive. We are
5	The background on these e-mails is that	5	evaluating it as it comes and meeting and
6	these were not original e-mail custodians	6	conferring with Florida on these issues.
7	agreed to by the parties, and there were	7	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Counsel
8	initially agreements that university e-mails	8	yes, sir?
9	would not be produced. In response to the	9	MR. PERRY: Your Honor, if I may
10	subpoena duces tecum that we received with	10	respond. It's Phil Perry.
11	their deposition notices, as well as in light	11	Mr. Primis, I think, indicated at the
12	of the Court's ruling on the Dr. Kistenmacher	12	outset of his explanation a moment ago that
12	e-mails, we have been endeavoring to work	12	there was an agreement not to share
	· -	-	-
14	with Florida to narrow what is a very large	14	university e-mails. Of course, we addressed
15	universe of e-mails that they have been	15	that during the argument on the motion to
16	seeking.	16	compel for Dr. Kistenmacher, and we disagree
17	And so, as Mr. Perry indicated, we have	17	with that.
18	been applying search terms trying to find	18	I would say in addition that our
19	reasonable ways to narrow these because our	19	University not represented by the same
20	burden objections are serious; and they are	20	counsel, but the University of Florida has
21	important. But if we can find a way to	21	produced e-mails to Georgia. And Georgia
22	address them, we will do that. And we have	22	for University of Florida professors. And
23	been attempting to do that.	23	Georgia has been using those e-mails in
24	We were surprised by some of the	24	depositions. So I think it would be
25	statements in the status report from Florida	25	inequitable if there were some situation
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	18		20
1	18 which suggested that we had not been	1	20 where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails
1		1	
	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been		where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did.
2	which suggested that we had not been	2	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that
2 3	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional	2 3	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did.
2 3 4	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last	2 3 4	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And
2 3 4 5 6	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report.	2 3 4 5	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be
2 3 4 5 6 7	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming	2 3 4 5 6 7	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe. We have been transparent about what the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail discussion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe. We have been transparent about what the search terms are yielding, and Mr. Perry	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail discussion. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe. We have been transparent about what the search terms are yielding, and Mr. Perry indicated that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail discussion. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis, do you want to respond to any part of that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe. We have been transparent about what the search terms are yielding, and Mr. Perry indicated that. And so once we get Mr. Perry's narrowed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail discussion. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis, do you want to respond to any part of that? MR. PRIMIS: Well, I just simply note
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe. We have been transparent about what the search terms are yielding, and Mr. Perry indicated that. And so once we get Mr. Perry's narrowed search terms, we will quickly apply them. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail discussion. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis, do you want to respond to any part of that? MR. PRIMIS: Well, I just simply note first that there's a give and take on these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	which suggested that we had not been responding to Florida, because we have been engaged with them in an ongoing process and, in fact, had provided them additional information on Thursday and Friday of last week that wasn't reflected in their report. So we are presently reviewing and aiming to produce the Dr. Georgakakos e-mails subject to the narrow search terms from his Georgia Tech account. His AOL e-mail box presented some separate issues because it's his personal e-mail account, and he was in Africa for much of the month of November. But now that he's back, we're endeavoring to do for those e-mails what we did with the Georgia Tech ones with the search terms. With regard to Dr. Masters and Dr. Hook, Dr. Masters did does have a very large amount of e-mail. And we have been engaged with Florida to try to narrow that universe. We have been transparent about what the search terms are yielding, and Mr. Perry indicated that. And so once we get Mr. Perry's narrowed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	where Georgia didn't have to produce e-mails that we did. I would say that I'm happy to hear that with respect to the Georgia Tech account that the information will be available soon. And I hope the same result will be will be forthcoming with respect to the account for Dr. Georgakakos's personal e-mails. As your Honor is incredibly aware and reminds us every time we have these calls, we have a strict schedule. And, you know, we have been trying to arrange our depositions in a way where we can get these documents and use them sufficiently soon that they're valuable for our depositions. And we have arranged the schedule for January and February contemplating that these e-mails would be something we can get very soon. So I just would like to, if I might, your Honor, put that point on the e-mail discussion. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis, do you want to respond to any part of that? MR. PRIMIS: Well, I just simply note

	21		23
1	things. And when we ask for search terms,	1	Georgia has identified or raised the question
2	they're not always expeditiously provided.	2	that Florida hasn't yet provided witnesses or
3	When they are provided, we run them	3	dates for a number of 30(b)(6) topics. Is
4	expeditiously. And so it's inaccurate to	4	there anything to be added to that, Georgia?
5	suggest that there's been a delay on	5	MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. We have
6	Georgia's part. We are working with Florida	6	been trying to pursue our 30(b)(6)
7	to try and do this in a reasonable and	7	deposition, which we served in September. So
8	efficient manner.	8	it was it's been pending for several
9	As well, with regard to the e-mails from	9	months. And we have been trying to secure
10	Dr. Kistenmacher, it is true a number of them	10	both the date and identity of witnesses.
11	were marked at day two of his deposition.	11	There we have obtained witnesses by
	But based on my review of the transcript, it		name and for date for some of the topics.
12		12	•
13	was largely a rehash of what had happened at	13	And we have been able to depose one
14	day one of his deposition, just using the	14	individual on one topic. But with regard to $20(h)(c)$ topics
15	e-mails to tee up the same issues that had	15	in particular the injury 30(b)(6) topics,
16	been explored through the reports and other	16	which we discussed last time and which we
17	documents for Dr. Kistenmacher that had been	17	have now revised to try and compromise with
18	previously provided.	18	Florida in terms of the scope, we still don't
19	So while we're engaging in this give	19	have dates or witnesses.
20	and take and are agreeable to producing	20	In addition, there are some topics for
21	these search-term-narrowed sets of e-mail,	21	which Florida has indicated that they have
22	I think that the value of that has been	22	dates; but they won't identify which
23	overstated. We'll do it, but it's not like	23	individuals in Florida are going to testify
24	there were magical moments in day two of	24	to those topics, which makes preparation for
25	Dr. Kistenmacher's deposition. It was	25	those depositions very difficult. And so it
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
			0.4
	22		24
1	essentially a replay of day one.	1	continues to be a source of concern.
2	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we	2	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and
2 3	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so.	2 3	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a
2 3 4	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.	2 3 4	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled.
2 3 4 5	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance	2 3 4 5	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be
2 3 4 5 6	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else	2 3 4 5 6	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty.
2 3 4 5 6 7	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note	2 3 4 5 6 7	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida? MR. PERRY: Phil Perry for Florida.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem putting forth a witness on underlying factual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida? MR. PERRY: Phil Perry for Florida. No, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem putting forth a witness on underlying factual material so long as the question isn't what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida? MR. PERRY: Phil Perry for Florida. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem putting forth a witness on underlying factual material so long as the question isn't what will your expert testimony be when the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida? MR. PERRY: Phil Perry for Florida. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem putting forth a witness on underlying factual material so long as the question isn't what will your expert testimony be when the deadline arrives.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida? MR. PERRY: Phil Perry for Florida. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem putting forth a witness on underlying factual material so long as the question isn't what will your expert testimony be when the deadline arrives. We have and we intend to provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	essentially a replay of day one. We're proceeding in good faith, and we will continue to do so. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. I recognize that volume in this instance is as heavy as it is in everything else attached to this matter. But I also note that this issue these issues have been the subject of meetings and conferring for months. You look at the progress reports; you review the transcripts. At some point it has to come to an end. So I'm going to suggest in fact, I'm going to tell you that I want you to report at the next status conference that the issues these issues have either been resolved or that there is a dispute ripe for resolution. Do you have any questions about that order? Florida? MR. PERRY: Phil Perry for Florida. No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	continues to be a source of concern. We do regularly exchange e-mails and meet and confer on deposition dates. And a number of depositions have been scheduled. But on the 30(b)(6), we still seem to be having difficulty. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Florida? MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I believe there's two more 30(b)(6) depositions scheduled the week of December 14 to 18 on multiple topics, if I'm not mistaken. If I might, your Honor, I would like to address this a little more broadly. We on a few of the topics which we saw as incredibly broad, we asked Georgia to narrow those topics both, practically, because it would be very difficult to prepare a witness on those topics, and because the topics called essentially for premature disclosure of expert testimony. We have no problem putting forth a witness on underlying factual material so long as the question isn't what will your expert testimony be when the deadline arrives.

FI	v.	G

	Telephone Cont	lerence	
	25		27
1	witnesses in January for the most part for	1	argument that gets at the facts and doesn't
2	those topics that have been in some dispute.	2	seek premature expert testimony. And that's
3	The reason we're able to do so now is because	3	by taking depositions regarding data on
4	Georgia very recently narrowed its topics.	4	the on the amount of species found or the
5	And the narrowed topics assist us to find the	5	number of species found at various points in
6	right person and schedule the 30(b)(6)	6	the bay over time, the salinity levels,
		-	
7	depositions.	7	nutrient measurements, and all that sort of
8	One point that I might remark on in	8	material that is already in our interrogatory
9	Georgia's status report is this; they argue,	9	responses.
10	I think, on page 2 that Florida pivoted from	10	We're very happy to supply witnesses on
11	its initial and long-standing focus on a 2012	11	those factual issues. And I'm generalizing
12	oyster collapse, and it now appears to claim	12	here because there are a great number of
13	that the entire Apalachicola Bay and nearly	13	specifications in their 30(b)(6) subpoena.
14	every plant and animal species will be	14	There are essentially 29 of them 28 with a
15	harmed.	15	subpart. And so we have satisfied a great
16	Your Honor, if I might address that	16	number of those already with either with
17	briefly, what we have is an argument called a	17	the deposition that occurred or the
18	productivity argument, a loss of	18	depositions that will occur this month and
19	productivity, essentially an argument that	19	those that are already scheduled. It's just
20	the unique estuarine environment in	20	as to these remaining topics where there's a
21	Apalachicola Bay is shrinking and that the	21	mix of expert testimony and underlying facts,
22	productivity of the area that is still the	22	we're trying to discipline the process so we
23	optimal mix of salinity is far smaller than	23	get a clarity at the outset that these will
23 24	it used to be. And that is caused in part by	23 24	be about the underlying factual issues and
			not a call for expert testimony.
25	low flows, a change in the nature of the THE REPORTING GROUP	25	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	26		28
1	nutrients, and higher salinities.	1	And I might add that we identified a
1 2	This is not a novel argument. It's an	1 2	number of cases in our status report. Not
	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at		number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that
2 3 4	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was	2	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because
2 3 4	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at	2 3	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that
2 3 4	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was	2 3 4	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because
2 3 4 5	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our	2 3 4 5	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the
2 3 4 5 6	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached	2 3 4 5 6	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been
2 3 4 5 6 7	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the	2 3 4 5 6 7	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of the community of various species. And then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now confirmed why we are entitled to 30(b)(6)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of the community of various species. And then we have identified exactly what those species	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now confirmed why we are entitled to 30(b)(6) testimony on those issues. We don't have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of the community of various species. And then we have identified exactly what those species are, what the phytoplankton and zooplankton	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now confirmed why we are entitled to 30(b)(6) testimony on those issues. We don't have to take Mr. Perry's word for it or his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of the community of various species. And then we have identified exactly what those species are, what the phytoplankton and zooplankton are, and so forth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now confirmed why we are entitled to 30(b)(6) testimony on those issues. We don't have to take Mr. Perry's word for it or his description, and I don't think Georgia has to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of the community of various species. And then we have identified exactly what those species are, what the phytoplankton and zooplankton are, and so forth. Mat so there is a way to get at that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now confirmed why we are entitled to 30(b)(6) testimony on those issues. We don't have to take Mr. Perry's word for it or his description, and I don't think Georgia has to wait until they find an expert to say what he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	This is not a novel argument. It's an argument we raised in our complaint at paragraph 57. It's an argument that was raised in the motion for leave to file our complaint at page 6 and in the attached declaration at paragraph 7 where the declarant explained that the reduced nutrient impacts and higher salinity levels will reduce estuarine productivity in general, and then went on from there to explain what that meant. Our interrogatory responses to the contention interrogatories on this have been very fulsome, including by explaining that oysters are an example of the loss of of the type of harm we're suffering, but more broadly, that the increases in salinity levels and reduction in nutrient levels in the bay will alter the entire structure of the community of various species. And then we have identified exactly what those species are, what the phytoplankton and zooplankton are, and so forth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	number of cases in our status report. Not because we think we have a dispute that currently needs resolution now, but because we wanted to identify for the Court the reason why we have for a couple weeks been going back and forth on the scope of these designations and the 30(b)(6) notice. It's because there's case law that recognizes that sometimes 30(b)(6) notices can be overbroad, and the impact of those can be improper, and contention interrogatories can better serve the party's needs. Here we think we have largely worked that out, and we expect that we will soon be able to have dates and witness names for Georgia, mostly in, if not all in January. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Primis? MR. PRIMIS: Yes, your Honor. I think Mr. Perry's discussion just now confirmed why we are entitled to 30(b)(6) testimony on those issues. We don't have to take Mr. Perry's word for it or his description, and I don't think Georgia has to

	29		31
	-		
1	just said. If there are people within the	1	would like to depose a representative on
2	State of Florida who study these issues and	2	behalf of the state who has the information
3	have factual information that support what	3	on what those specific items are.
4	Mr. Perry just said, we are entitled to take	4	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Mr. Perry, do
5	their deposition in the 30(b)(6) context.	5	you want to comment further; or is this
6	And that's all we have been seeking from the	6	discussion done?
7	beginning. We haven't sought contention	7	MR. PERRY: Only briefly, your Honor.
8	interrogatories through 30(b)(6) topics. We	8	And I and I may disagree with
9	haven't sought expert testimony through	9	Mr. Primis; but I think we have got our
		-	
10	30(b)(6) topics. We just want to understand	10	issues mostly worked out.
11	what the factual basis is for the things that	11	I will say just in closing on this issue
12	Mr. Perry just said.	12	that this isn't a new argument. It was in
13	And based on our review of the documents	13	our complaint. It was in all the papers we
14	and the thrust of the complaint, while it	14	filed at the outset, as I cited.
15	does mention the overall ecology of	15	I will also say that there is a
16	Apalachicola Bay, when we have looked for	16	considerable amount of authority out there
17	documents and pressed Florida on what has	17	explaining the use of these theories.
18	actually been harmed, what species in the bay	18	They're well grounded scientifically. The
19	at present have been harmed due to Georgia,	19	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has addressed
20	the only one that we can identify that they	20	these types of productivity arguments in many
21	have taken the position in internal documents	21	cases, including the consolidated delta smelt
22	is due to Georgia are the oysters. And the	22	cases. And, of course, EPA and NOAA have
23	complaint references some other species, but	23	brought forth theories of this type in
	• • •	23	
24	it doesn't ever say they have been harmed due		various different regulatory and litigation
25	to Georgia's water use.	25	context.
	THE REPORTING GROUP		THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart		Mason & Lockhart
	30		32
1	So we have simply been trying to get at	1	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is
1 2		1 2	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change
	So we have simply been trying to get at		And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is
2	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming	2	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change
2 3	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm.	2 3	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it;
2 3 4	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry	2 3 4	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out.
2 3 4 5	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological	2 3 4 5	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic,
2 3 4 5 6 7	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal	2 3 4 5 6 7	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type deposition request or to get expert testimony	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type deposition request or to get expert testimony in a patent case. That's not what we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type deposition request or to get expert testimony in a patent case. That's not what we're talking about here. Florida has asserted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything else
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type deposition request or to get expert testimony in a patent case. That's not what we're talking about here. Florida has asserted that certain plants and animals have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything else you want to add, status reports, Florida?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type deposition request or to get expert testimony in a patent case. That's not what we're talking about here. Florida has asserted that certain plants and animals have been harmed and that certain businesses have been harmed due to Georgia's water use. And we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything else you want to add, status reports, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So we have simply been trying to get at what exactly it is that Florida is claiming in this case. And the and their harm. And over time, the benefit one benefit of our asking these questions is that Mr. Perry has identified reduced ecological productivity as one as their principal alleged harm. And so, now, we're trying to explore the factual basis for that and determine whether anyone in Florida who studied these matters for the state has ever said that. And so it sounds like we're on a path to get those witnesses, which is a good thing. I think the cases identified in Florida's status report are totally inapposite and are directed at different issues where a party is seeking to gain another party's work product through a contention interrogatory type deposition request or to get expert testimony in a patent case. That's not what we're talking about here. Florida has asserted that certain plants and animals have been harmed and that certain businesses have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And so to the extent that Mr. Primis is suggesting that there's somehow been a change here, I think that's not the way we see it; and I don't think that documents bear that out. So with that, I'll close on this topic, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you. Counsel, I can't overemphasize the importance of prompt identification of witnesses and scheduling of depositions. So I'm directing that at your next progress report, next status conference, you should tell me that you have completed identifying the witnesses; and you have proposed deposition dates for all of them who are under your control. Any questions about that, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Georgia? MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor. SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Anything else you want to add, status reports, Florida? MR. PERRY: No, your Honor.

	33
1	MR. PRIMIS: No, your Honor.
2	SPECIAL MASTER LANCASTER: Thank you
2	
	very much. We are done.
4	MR. PERRY: Thank you, your Honor.
5	MR. PRIMIS: Thank you.
6	(The telephone conference was concluded
7	at 10:35 a.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 10	
19 00	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	THE REPORTING GROUP
	Mason & Lockhart
	34
1	CERTIFICATE
	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> I. Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public
2	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public
2 3	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify
2 3 4	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 pages are a correct
2 3 4 5	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the
2 3 4 5 6	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the above-captioned proceedings.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 pages are a correct transcript of my stenographic notes of the above-captioned proceedings. I further certify that I am a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public My Commission Expires June 9, 2019.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I, Claudette G. Mason, a Notary Public in and for the State of Maine, hereby certify that the foregoing 33 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 10th day of December, 2015. Notary Public

35

			1	
1	accounts [1] - 14:3	16:13	24:15	Commercial [1] - 1:11
	action [1] - 34:9	area [1] - 25:22	broadly [2] - 24:13,	Commission [1] -
10:00 [1] - 1:13	add [3] - 12:19, 28:1,	argue [1] - 25:9	26:18	34:18
10:35 [1] - 33:7	32:23	argument [9] - 19:15,	brought [1] - 31:23	communications [1] -
10th [1] - 34:11	added [1] - 23:4	25:17, 25:18, 25:19,	burden [3] - 14:24,	15:5
14 [1] - 24:10	addition [2] - 19:18,	26:2, 26:3, 26:4,	16:19, 17:20	community [1] - 26:21
142 [1] - 1:1	23:20	27:1, 31:12	business [1] - 14:16	compel [1] - 19:16
18 [1] - 24:10	additional [2] - 13:7,	arguments [1] - 31:20	businesses [1] -	complaint [5] - 26:3,
	- 18:4	arrange [1] - 20:12	30:24	26:6, 29:14, 29:23,
2	address [7] - 14:13,	arranged [1] - 20:16	busy [1] - 11:11	31:13
2 [1] - 25:10	14:15, 14:17, 15:7,	arranging [2] - 5:1,	buy [1] - 8:3	completed [1] - 32:14
2012 [1] - 25:11	17:22, 24:13, 25:16	10:11	buy-in [1] - 8:3	complexity [1] - 10:13
2015 [2] - 1:12, 34:11	addressed [2] - 19:14,	arrives [1] - 24:24		compromise [1] -
2019 [1] - 34:19	31:19	asserted [1] - 30:22	C	23:17
254 [1] - 1:11	advertises [1] - 13:18	assess [1] - 11:14	colondorus 11/12	concern [1] - 24:1
28 [1] - 27:14	Africa [1] - 18:13	assist [1] - 25:5	calendar [1] - 11:13	conclude [1] - 9:20
29 [1] - 27:14	afternoon [1] - 16:16	assistant [1] - 2:8	candidates [1] - 6:1	concluded [1] - 33:6
20[1] 21.14	ago [3] - 7:18, 13:1,	assuming [1] - 19:1	captioned [1] - 34:6	confer [1] - 24:3
3	19:12	assumption [1] - 7:22	case [10] - 2:7, 11:1,	conference [6] - 4:7,
5	agree [5] - 5:6, 5:8,	attached [2] - 22:7,	11:6, 12:23, 13:4, 13:16, 15:0, 28:0	6:4, 6:8, 22:15,
3,000 [1] - 14:8	6:11, 7:14, 10:15	26:6	13:16, 15:9, 28:9, 30:3, 30:21	32:13, 33:6
30(b)(6 [13] - 23:3,	agreeable [1] - 21:20	attempted [1] - 12:22	30:3, 30:21 cases [4] - 28:2,	CONFERENCE [1] -
23:6, 23:15, 24:5,	agreed [4] - 5:10,	attempting [1] - 17:23	cases [4] - 28:2, 30:15, 31:21, 31:22	1:9
24:9, 25:6, 27:13,	7:25, 12:6, 17:7	attorneys [1] - 5:18	caused [1] - 25:24	conferences [1] - 6:15
28:8, 28:10, 28:21,	agreement [1] - 19:13	Atwood [1] - 1:11		conferring [2] - 19:6,
29:5, 29:8, 29:10	agreements [1] - 17:8	authority [4] - 8:23,	Center [1] - 16:1	22:9
33 [1] - 34:4	agricultural [1] - 16:2	9:5, 12:2, 31:16	centrally [1] - 11:2	confident [1] - 15:19
	ahead [1] - 19:3	automobile [1] - 15:14	certain [2] - 30:23, 30:24	confidential [1] - 5:3
5	aiming [2] - 8:15, 18:7	available [1] - 20:5	certainly [1] - 7:4	confined [1] - 13:23
57 (4) 06:4	Albany [1] - 15:24	aware [2] - 14:15, 20:9	-	confirmed [1] - 28:21
57 [1] - 26:4	alleged [1] - 30:8		CERTIFICATE [1] - 34:1	confusion [1] - 3:12
6	Allen [4] - 2:16, 3:8,	В	certify [2] - 34:3, 34:7	consensual [1] - 8:7
6	3:13, 3:15	bookground w 17:5	change [3] - 16:16,	consensus [5] - 7:9,
6 [2] - 16:8, 26:6	ALLEN [1] - 1:16	background [1] - 17:5 based [2] - 21:12,	25:25, 32:2	7:12, 8:17, 9:13,
	Allon [2] - 3:3, 3:16	29:13	circumspect [1] - 4:15	12:4
7	ALLON [1] - 1:18	Basin [1] - 16:3	cited [1] - 31:14	considerable [1] -
7	allows [2] - 9:25,	basis [3] - 4:4, 29:11,	claim [1] - 25:12	31:16
7 [2] - 16:9, 26:7	10:11	30:9	claiming [1] - 30:2	consolidated [1] -
0	alter [1] - 26:20	bay [3] - 26:20, 27:6,	clarifying [1] - 3:18	31:21
8	amount [3] - 18:19,	29:18	clarity [1] - 27:23	contemplating [1] -
8 [1] - 1:12	27:4, 31:16		Claudette [3] - 1:13,	20:17
	animal [1] - 25:14	Bay [3] - 25:13, 25:21, 29:16	2:9, 34:2	contention [4] - 26:14,
9	animals [1] - 30:23	bear [1] - 32:4	clear [3] - 3:12, 4:7,	28:12, 29:7, 30:19
	anticipate [1] - 12:4	bear [1] - 32.4 become [1] - 11:22	4:19	context [2] - 29:5,
9 [1] - 34:19	anticipating [1] - 6:10	beginning [2] - 5:13,	clients [3] - 8:4, 9:4,	31:25
_	anyway [1] - 9:11	29:7	12:1	continue [1] - 22:3
Α	AOL [1] - 18:10	begun [2] - 4:18, 9:16	CLIFFORD [1] - 1:22	continued [1] - 13:2
a.m [2] - 1:13, 33:7	Apalachicola [3] -	behalf [1] - 31:2	Clifford [1] - 2:8	continues [1] - 24:1
able [4] - 13:6, 23:13,	25:13, 25:21, 29:16	benefit [2] - 30:4	close [2] - 13:18, 32:6	continuing [1] - 12:16
25:3, 28:16	APPEARANCES [1] -	best [1] - 11:3	closing [1] - 31:11	control [1] - 32:17
above-captioned [1] -	1:15	better [2] - 7:6, 28:12	collapse [1] - 25:12	convenience [1] -
34:6	appearances [1] -	between [1] - 7:24	colleague [1] - 3:2	11:10
above-named [1] -	2:11	bit [2] - 11:12, 13:4	color [1] - 5:9	conversation [1] -
34:9	apply [1] - 18:25	box [2] - 11:12, 13:4 box [2] - 15:14, 18:10	commencing [1] -	5:22
	applying [1] - 17:18		1:12	core [1] - 10:1
		briefly [2] - 25:17,		correct [2] - 6:21, 34:4
acceptable [2] - 7:5,	appreciate [1] - 10:7	_	comment rai - 0·1	
acceptable [2] - 7:5, 7:25	approach [1] - 9:24	31:7	comment [3] - 9:1, 15:11 31:5	counsel [7] - 2:4, 8:1,
acceptable [2] - 7:5, 7:25 account [7] - 14:4,		31:7 Britt [1] - 3:5	15:11, 31:5	8:4, 9:12, 19:7,
acceptable [2] - 7:5, 7:25 account [7] - 14:4, 18:10, 18:12, 20:4,	approach [1] - 9:24 appropriate [1] - 5:17	31:7 Britt [1] - 3:5 BRITT [1] - 1:19	15:11, 31:5 comments [4] - 4:1,	8:4, 9:12, 19:7, 19:20, 32:9
acceptable [2] - 7:5, 7:25 account [7] - 14:4,	approach [1] - 9:24 appropriate [1] - 5:17 appropriately [1] - TH	31:7 Britt [1] - 3:5 BRITT [1] - 1:19	15:11, 31:5 comments [4] - 4:1, ROUP j:12, 10:8	8:4, 9:12, 19:7,

- Mason & Lockhart -

 \sim

r				
course [4] - 13:1,	24:17	14:25, 15:2, 15:3,	experience [2] - 9:12,	30:2, 30:10, 30:22,
14:11, 19:14, 31:22	difficulty [1] - 24:6	15:5, 15:7, 15:11,	11:18	32:18, 32:23
COURT [1] - 1:1	diligence [1] - 7:4	15:16, 15:21, 15:23,	experienced [2] - 9:3,	Florida's [2] - 10:9,
Court [1] - 28:5	directed [1] - 30:17	16:23, 17:5, 17:8,	10:21	30:15
Court's [1] - 17:12	directing [1] - 32:12	17:13, 17:15, 18:8,	expert [8] - 24:20,	flows [1] - 25:25
Craig [4] - 2:25, 3:10,	director [2] - 13:17,	18:15, 19:14, 19:21,	24:23, 27:2, 27:21,	focus [2] - 16:5, 25:11
5:7, 17:3	15:25	19:23, 20:1, 20:8,	27:25, 28:25, 29:9,	focused [4] - 11:21,
CRAIG [1] - 1:18		20:17, 21:9, 21:15,	30:20	13:14, 16:1, 16:19
	disagree [2] - 19:16, 31:8	24:2	Expires [1] - 34:18	focusing [1] - 8:15
critical [1] - 12:23		earliest [1] - 11:10	explain [1] - 26:11	foregoing [1] - 34:4
CRR [1] - 1:13	discipline [1] - 27:22	ecological [1] - 30:6	explained [1] - 26:8	
custodians [1] - 17:6	disclosing [1] - 7:13	ecology [1] - 29:15		format [1] - 9:23
-	disclosure [1] - 24:19	efficiency [1] - 6:13	explaining [2] - 26:15,	forth [4] - 24:21,
D	discussed [2] - 4:21,	-	31:17	26:24, 28:7, 31:23
data [1] - 27:3	23:16	efficient [1] - 21:8	explanation [2] -	forthcoming [1] - 20:7
date [2] - 23:10, 23:12	discussing [1] - 11:17	effort [1] - 6:22	15:15, 19:12	forward [4] - 10:3,
dates [6] - 23:3, 23:19,	discussion [7] - 4:18,	either [2] - 22:16,	explicitly [1] - 7:23	11:3, 11:14, 11:16
23:22, 24:3, 28:16,	4:25, 6:17, 6:24,	27:16	explore [1] - 30:9	free [2] - 4:1, 12:1
32:16	20:21, 28:20, 31:6	Ellis [1] - 3:1	explored [1] - 21:16	Friday [1] - 18:5
deadline [1] - 24:24	disinterested [1] -	end [4] - 6:25, 9:7,	extent [1] - 32:1	fruit [1] - 13:24
December [3] - 1:12,	34:8	11:17, 22:12		fulsome [1] - 26:15
	dispute [4] - 11:2,	endeavoring [2] -	F	
24:10, 34:11	22:17, 25:2, 28:3	17:13, 18:14	fact (2) 15.1 10.4	G
decision [7] - 7:8, 8:2,	Division [1] - 13:20	engaged [3] - 6:22,	fact [3] - 15:1, 18:4, 22:13	noin (1) 20:10
8:17, 8:18, 8:24, 9:8,	documents [10] -	18:3, 18:19		gain [1] - 30:18
9:18	12:17, 12:22, 15:12,	engaging [1] - 21:19	facts [3] - 11:5, 27:1,	general [1] - 26:10
decisions [1] - 12:3	15:17, 20:13, 21:17,	engine [1] - 15:14	27:21	generalizing [1] -
declarant [1] - 26:8	29:13, 29:17, 29:21,	entire [2] - 25:13,	factual [6] - 24:21,	27:11
declaration [1] - 26:7	32:4	26:20	27:11, 27:24, 29:3,	gentleman [1] - 13:11
Defendants [1] - 1:7	done [4] - 6:2, 7:8,	entities [1] - 7:15	29:11, 30:9	Georgakakos [6] -
define [1] - 16:17	31:6, 33:3	entitled [2] - 28:21,	failure [2] - 8:20, 9:14	13:11, 13:17, 14:3,
delay [1] - 21:5	doomed [2] - 8:20,	29:4	fairly [2] - 8:8, 10:1	15:3, 15:21, 18:8
delegate [1] - 9:5	9:14	entity [1] - 13:18	faith [2] - 5:19, 22:2	Georgakakos's [3] -
delta [1] - 31:21	dozen [1] - 14:13	environment [1] -	familiar [1] - 7:16	14:14, 15:4, 20:8
depose [4] - 15:7,	Dr [26] - 12:25, 13:11,	25:20	far [1] - 25:23	GEORGIA [1] - 1:6
16:7, 23:13, 31:1	13:12, 13:14, 13:17,	Environmental [1] -	favorite [1] - 4:10	Georgia [46] - 1:18,
deposition [12] - 13:3,	14:3, 14:10, 14:14,	13:20	February [1] - 20:17	2:24, 3:2, 3:6, 3:9,
15:4, 17:11, 21:11,	15:4, 15:11, 15:21,	EPA [1] - 31:22	few [2] - 12:25, 24:14	3:11, 5:5, 6:1, 6:25,
21:14, 21:25, 23:7,	15:23, 16:4, 16:8,	ESQ [8] - 1:16, 1:16,	field [1] - 14:6	7:1, 7:20, 7:22,
24:3, 27:17, 29:5,	16:13, 16:22, 17:12,	1:17, 1:18, 1:18,	file [1] - 26:5	10:14, 12:10, 12:18,
30:20, 32:16	18:8, 18:17, 18:18,	1:19, 1:20, 1:21	filed [1] - 31:14	13:9, 13:13, 13:19,
depositions [11] -	19:16, 20:8, 21:10,	essentially [5] - 15:13,	finishes [1] - 7:3	13:22, 14:1, 14:5,
16:25, 19:24, 20:12,	21:17, 21:25	22:1, 24:19, 25:19,	first [7] - 4:17, 10:23,	14:19, 14:22, 15:25,
20:15, 23:25, 24:4,	driving [1] - 8:6	27:14	11:7, 12:1, 14:3,	16:5, 16:11, 17:2,
24:9, 25:7, 27:3,	duces [1] - 17:10	estuarine [2] - 25:20,	15:10, 20:25	17:4, 18:10, 18:16,
27:18, 32:11	duces [1] - 17:10 due [5] - 7:3, 29:19,	26:10	Fish [1] - 31:19	19:21, 19:23, 20:1,
describing [1] - 7:17	29:22, 29:24, 30:25	evaluate [2] - 5:16,	flexibility [1] - 10:12	20:4, 22:23, 23:1,
description [1] - 28:24	DUNLAP [1] - 1:21	5:25	flexible [1] - 10:19	23:4, 24:15, 25:4,
designations [1] -		5.25 evaluating [1] - 19:5	Flint [1] - 16:3	28:17, 28:24, 29:19,
28:8	Dunlap [1] - 2:7	• • •	FLORIDA [1] - 1:3	29:22, 32:20, 32:25
detail [1] - 9:23	during [1] - 19:15	event [1] - 34:8	Florida [36] - 1:16,	Georgia's [4] - 21:6,
details [1] - 7:13		evolve [1] - 11:19	2:12, 2:13, 2:18,	25:9, 29:25, 30:25
determine [1] - 30:10	E	exactly [4] - 4:19,	2:12, 2:13, 2:18, 2:20, 4:22, 6:18,	given [1] - 11:4
developed [1] - 10:21	e-mail [13] - 14:4,	15:16, 26:22, 30:2	6:20, 7:10, 9:20,	God [1] - 8:19
developed [1] - 10.21 development [1] -	14:6, 14:9, 14:13,	example [1] - 26:16	12:11, 12:15, 12:20,	Grant [1] - 3:5
7:19	14:14, 14:20, 14:22,	exchange [4] - 5:11,		GRANT [2] - 1:19, 3:4
	17:6, 18:10, 18:12,	5:14, 5:19, 24:2	17:14, 17:25, 18:2, 18:20, 10:6, 10:20	Gray [1] - 3:21
DEVORA [1] - 1:18	18:19, 20:20, 21:21	exchanged [1] - 10:20	18:20, 19:6, 19:20, 10:22, 21:6, 22:20	GRAY [3] - 1:20, 3:20,
Devora [2] - 3:3, 3:16	e-mails [32] - 12:25,	exercise [1] - 15:19	19:22, 21:6, 22:20,	4:8
different [3] - 14:2,	13:5, 13:7, 13:9,	expect [1] - 28:15	22:21, 23:2, 23:18,	gray [1] - 3:23
30:17, 31:24		DEDODETNC CI	23:21, 23:23, 24:7,	great [3] - 15:7, 27:12,
difficult [2] - 23:25,	17.0, 17.12, 17.1 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP), 29:2, 29:17,	Υισαι [0] - 10.1, 21.12,
		•	•	

Mason & Lockhart

37

	1	1	1	1
27:15	important [6] - 6:11,	January [4] - 16:8,	10:18	maximize [1] - 10:10
ground [1] - 5:20	8:3, 10:17, 16:21,	20:16, 25:1, 28:17	long-standing [1] -	maximizes [1] - 10:5
grounded [1] - 31:18	16:24, 17:21	Josh [1] - 2:7	25:11	meant [2] - 8:14,
3	improper [1] - 28:11	JOSHUA [1] - 1:21	look [1] - 22:10	26:12
Н	IN [1] - 34:10	jump [1] - 4:2	looked [2] - 3:24,	measurements [1] -
	inaccurate [1] - 21:4	June [1] - 34:19	29:16	27:7
hand [1] - 34:10	inapposite [1] - 30:16	June [1] - 04.18	loss [2] - 25:18, 26:16	mediate [1] - 9:25
happy [2] - 20:3, 27:10	inbox [4] - 14:7, 14:9,	V	low [1] - 25:25	mediation [8] - 4:11,
harm [3] - 26:17, 30:3,		K	low [1] - 23.23	
30:8	14:20, 14:22	keep [2] - 11:15, 11:21	M	4:18, 4:21, 5:3, 6:17,
harmed [6] - 25:15,	including [3] - 5:3,	key [1] - 6:12	M	9:17, 9:20, 12:7
29:18, 29:19, 29:24,	26:15, 31:21	Kirkland [1] - 3:1	magical [1] - 21:24	mediator [17] - 5:4,
30:24, 30:25	incomparable [1] - 2:9	Kistenmacher [10] -	mail [13] - 14:4, 14:6,	5:11, 6:7, 6:9, 6:23,
heading [1] - 11:15	increases [1] - 26:18	13:12, 13:14, 14:10,	14:9, 14:13, 14:14,	7:8, 7:25, 8:5, 8:11,
hear [2] - 14:18, 20:3	incredible [1] - 14:24	14:12, 15:2, 15:11,	14:20, 14:22, 17:6,	8:13, 8:14, 9:5, 9:22,
heard [1] - 16:11	incredibly [3] - 15:18,	17:12, 19:16, 21:10,	18:10, 18:12, 18:19,	10:25, 11:9, 11:15,
heavy [1] - 22:6	20:9, 24:15	21:17	20:20, 21:21	12:6
held [1] - 1:10	independent [1] - 9:12	Kistenmacher's [2] -	mails [32] - 12:25,	mediator's [2] - 10:17,
help [1] - 13:15	indicated [5] - 4:17,	12:25, 21:25	13:5, 13:7, 13:9,	11:9
helpful [1] - 15:18	17:17, 18:23, 19:11,	knowledge [1] - 11:5	14:8, 14:12, 14:14,	mediators [1] - 10:19
hereby [1] - 34:3	23:21	knows [1] - 8:19	14:25, 15:2, 15:3,	meet [1] - 24:3
	individual [2] - 7:15,	NIIOW3[I]-0.13	15:5, 15:7, 15:11,	meeting [2] - 6:12,
higher [2] - 26:1, 26:9	23:14	1	15:16, 15:21, 15:23,	19:5
Honor [35] - 2:5, 2:14,	individuals [2] -	L L	16:23, 17:5, 17:8,	meetings [1] - 22:9
2:23, 2:25, 3:5, 3:20,	15:22, 23:23	LANCASTER [36] -	17:13, 17:15, 18:8,	mention [1] - 29:15
3:21, 4:23, 5:7, 6:19,	inequitable [1] - 19:25	1:10, 2:3, 2:6, 2:17,	18:15, 19:14, 19:21,	Merrill's [1] - 1:11
7:11, 7:21, 9:21,	information [5] - 9:6,	2:21, 2:24, 3:7, 3:17,	19:23, 20:1, 20:8,	met [1] - 4:20
10:6, 12:9, 12:12,	18:5, 20:5, 29:3,	3:23, 4:9, 5:5, 6:3,	20:17, 21:9, 21:15,	methodologies [1] -
12:21, 17:3, 19:9,	31:2	6:16, 7:1, 7:7, 7:20,	24:2	10:22
20:9, 20:20, 22:22,	initial [1] - 25:11	8:10, 8:16, 10:14,	Maine [3] - 1:12, 1:14,	Michael [1] - 3:21
22:24, 23:5, 24:8,	injury [1] - 23:15	11:24, 12:10, 12:13,	34:3	MICHAEL [1] - 1:20
24:12, 25:16, 28:19,	input [2] - 10:18, 11:4	17:2, 19:7, 20:22,	makers [1] - 8:2	might [6] - 11:12,
31:7, 32:7, 32:19,	instance [1] - 22:5	22:4, 22:23, 22:25,	manager [1] - 2:8	20:19, 24:12, 25:8,
32:21, 32:24, 33:1,	integrally [1] - 13:21	24:7, 28:18, 31:4,	manner [1] - 21:8	25:16, 28:1
33:4 Namaria wa 5:40	intend [3] - 9:19,	32:8, 32:20, 32:22,		mindful [1] - 5:12
Honor's [1] - 5:12	10:19, 24:25	32:25, 33:2	Mark [2] - 15:23, 16:8	mistaken [1] - 24:11
Hook [3] - 16:4, 16:22,	interim [1] - 11:23	large [2] - 17:14,	marked [1] - 21:11	mix [2] - 25:23, 27:21
18:17	internal [1] - 29:21	18:18	MARY [1] - 1:22	moment [2] - 7:18,
hope [3] - 6:23, 9:15,	interrogatories [3] -	largely [2] - 21:13,	Mary [1] - 2:8	19:12
20:6	26:14, 28:12, 29:8	28:14	Mason [3] - 1:13, 2:9,	moments [1] - 21:24
hopeful [1] - 9:17	interrogatory [3] -	last [7] - 3:13, 4:20,	34:2	month [3] - 5:11,
hopefully [1] - 8:9	26:13, 27:8, 30:19	4:24, 5:10, 5:22,	MASTER [36] - 1:9,	18:13, 27:18
hydrology [1] - 13:21	invaluable [1] - 13:5	18:5, 23:16	2:3, 2:6, 2:17, 2:21,	months [2] - 22:10,
-	invitation [1] - 4:6	law [2] - 1:10, 28:9	2:24, 3:7, 3:17, 3:23,	23:9
I	involved [2] - 10:13,	lawyers [4] - 7:9, 8:18,	4:9, 5:5, 6:3, 6:16,	morning [6] - 2:3, 2:5,
identification [1] -	13:21	8:23, 9:3	7:1, 7:7, 7:20, 8:10,	2:15, 2:19, 3:4, 3:21
32:10	issue [2] - 22:8, 31:11	lead [2] - 8:10, 8:14	8:16, 10:14, 11:24,	most [1] - 25:1
identified [7] - 5:14,	issues [19] - 10:1,	learned [1] - 15:1	12:10, 12:13, 17:2,	mostly [2] - 28:17,
	11:1, 12:14, 13:15,	leave [1] - 26:5	19:7, 20:22, 22:4,	31:10
13:8, 23:1, 26:22, 28:1, 30:6, 30:15	13:21, 13:24, 15:8,	legal [1] - 2:8	22:23, 22:25, 24:7,	motion [2] - 19:15,
identify [5] - 5:13,	18:11, 19:6, 21:15,	levels [4] - 26:9,	28:18, 31:4, 32:8,	26:5
-	22:8, 22:16, 27:11,	26:19, 27:6	32:20, 32:22, 32:25,	move [3] - 6:2, 10:12,
14:12, 23:22, 28:5, 20:20	27:24, 28:22, 29:2,	light [1] - 17:11	33:2	11:14
29:20	30:17, 31:10	-	masters [3] - 16:13,	moving [3] - 6:14, 8:8,
identifying [1] - 32:14	items [1] - 31:3	likely [1] - 16:20	18:17, 18:18	11:16
identity [1] - 23:10	iterative [1] - 11:20	limit [1] - 9:19	Masters [2] - 15:23,	MR [37] - 2:5, 2:13,
impact [1] - 28:11	itself [1] - 13:18	line [2] - 2:16, 3:5	16:8	2:15, 2:19, 2:23,
impacts [1] - 26:9	1.3011 [1] - 13.10	lists [1] - 5:17	material [2] - 24:22,	2:25, 3:10, 3:20, 4:8,
impediment [1] -	1	litigation [1] - 31:24	27:8	4:23, 5:7, 6:6, 6:19,
11:22	J	LLP [2] - 1:11, 3:1	matter [1] - 22:7	7:2, 7:11, 7:21, 8:12,
importance [1] - 32:10	James [1] - 16:4 TH	E REPORTING G	ROUP ^{'s [1] - 30:11}	9:21, 10:15, 12:9,
			1	0.21, 10.10, 12.0,
ı	№	lason & Lockha	art.	

Mason & Lockhart —

25:18, 25:19, 25:22,

26:10, 30:7, 31:20

professors [3] - 12:17,

professor [1] - 16:6

progress [9] - 3:24,

4:12, 4:17, 6:22,

22:10, 32:12

9:16, 11:23, 12:15,

13:8. 19:22

	38
power [1] - 9:10	32:15
practically [1] - 24:16	Protection [1] - 13:20
premature [2] - 24:10	provide [1] - 24:25
27:2	provided [5] - 18:4,
premium [1] - 16:9	21:2, 21:3, 21:18,
preparation [1] -	23:2
23:24	Public [3] - 1:14, 34:2,
prepare [1] - 24:17	34:15
Present [1] - 1:21	purposes [1] - 6:14
	pursue [2] - 13:10,
present [1] - 29:19	23:6
presented [1] - 18:11	pursuing [1] - 16:25
presently [1] - 18:7	pursuing [1] = 10.23 put [2] - 5:9, 20:20
pressed [1] - 29:17	putting [2] - 16:9,
pressure [1] - 11:20	24:21
previously [1] - 21:18	24.21
PRIMIS [18] - 1:18,	Q
2:25, 3:10, 5:7, 6:6,	Y
7:2, 7:21, 8:12,	questions [5] - 4:16,
10:15, 12:9, 17:3,	12:8, 22:18, 30:5,
20:24, 22:24, 23:5,	32:18
28:19, 32:21, 33:1,	quickly [6] - 8:8, 9:18,
33:5 Brimin (18) 2:25	10:1, 10:12, 11:14,
Primis [13] - 2:25,	18:25
	10.20
3:10, 3:18, 4:24, 5:8,	
6:21, 7:17, 17:4,	quite [1] - 13:3
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18,	
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1	quite [1] - 13:3
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15,
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 RALPH [1] - 1:10
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23,	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 RALPH [1] - 1:10 range [3] - 15:6, 15:8,
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 RALPH [1] - 1:10 range [3] - 15:6, 15:8, 16:24
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2 proceedings [1] - 34:6	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 RALPH [1] - 1:10 range [3] - 15:6, 15:8, 16:24 rapidly [1] - 10:24
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 RALPH [1] - 1:10 range [3] - 15:6, 15:8, 16:24 rapidly [1] - 10:24 rather [2] - 6:4, 12:3
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2 proceedings [1] - 34:6 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 2:2	quite [1] - 13:3 R raised [4] - 12:15, 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 RALPH [1] - 1:10 range [3] - 15:6, 15:8, 16:24 rapidly [1] - 10:24 rather [2] - 6:4, 12:3 reaction [1] - 15:20
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2 proceedings [1] - 34:6 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 2:2 process [12] - 5:1, 5:3,	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceeding}[1]-34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2 proceedings [1] - 34:6 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 2:2 process [12] - 5:1, 5:3,	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$ 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 $$$ RALPH$ [1] - 1:10 $$$ $$ range [3] - 15:6, 15:8, $$$ 16:24 $$$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings}[1]-34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ 8:7,9:23,10:11,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, \\ $23:1, 26:3, 26:5$ \\ \hline \mathbf{RALPH} [1] - 1:10$ \\ \hline \mathbf{range} [3] - 15:6, 15:8, \\ $16:24$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{rapidly}$ [1] - 10:24$ \\ \hline \mathbf{rather} [2] - 6:4, 12:3$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{reaction}$ [1] - 15:20$ \\ \hline \mathbf{read} [1] - 15:19$ \\ \hline \mathbf{ready} [2] - 6:1, 7:2$ \\ \hline \mathbf{reason} [2] - 25:3, 28:6$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{reasonable}$ [4] - \\ \hline \end{tabular}$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings}[1]-34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ 8:7,9:23,10:11,\\ 11:16,18:3,27:22\\ \textbf{processes}[1]-11:20\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings}[1]-34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ 8:7,9:23,10:11,\\ 11:16,18:3,27:22\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, \\ $23:1, 26:3, 26:5$ \\ \hline \mathbf{RALPH} [1] - 1:10$ \\ \hline \mathbf{range} [3] - 15:6, 15:8, \\ $16:24$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{rapidly}$ [1] - 10:24$ \\ \hline \mathbf{rather} [2] - 6:4, 12:3$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{reaction}$ [1] - 15:20$ \\ \hline \mathbf{read} [1] - 15:19$ \\ \hline \mathbf{reason} [2] - 25:3, 28:6$ \\ \hline $\mathbf{reasonable}$ [4] - $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $ $
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings}[1]-34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ 8:7,9:23,10:11,\\ 11:16,18:3,27:22\\ \textbf{processes}[1]-11:20\\ \textbf{produce}[4]-14:24,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21, 7:17, 17:4,\\ 19:11, 20:22, 28:18,\\ 31:9, 32:1\\ \textbf{principal} [1] - 30:7\\ \textbf{private} [1] - 14:14\\ \textbf{problem} [1] - 24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding} [2] - 7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings} [1] - 34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS} [1] - \\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process} [12] - 5:1, 5:3,\\ 6:12, 7:9, 7:12, 8:4,\\ 8:7, 9:23, 10:11,\\ 11:16, 18:3, 27:22\\ \textbf{processes} [1] - 11:20\\ \textbf{produce} [4] - 14:24,\\ 18:8, 19:2, 20:1\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings}[1]-34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ 8:7,9:23,10:11,\\ 11:16,18:3,27:22\\ \textbf{processes}[1]-11:20\\ \textbf{produce}[4]-14:24,\\ 18:8,19:2,20:1\\ \textbf{produced}[2]-17:9,\\ 19:21\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21, 7:17, 17:4,\\ 19:11, 20:22, 28:18,\\ 31:9, 32:1\\ \textbf{principal} [1] - 30:7\\ \textbf{private} [1] - 14:14\\ \textbf{problem} [1] - 24:20\\ \textbf{proceeding} [2] - 7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \textbf{proceedings} [1] - 34:6\\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS} [1] - \\ 2:2\\ \textbf{process} [12] - 5:1, 5:3,\\ 6:12, 7:9, 7:12, 8:4,\\ 8:7, 9:23, 10:11,\\ 11:16, 18:3, 27:22\\ \textbf{processes} [1] - 11:20\\ \textbf{produce} [4] - 14:24,\\ 18:8, 19:2, 20:1\\ \textbf{produced} [2] - 17:9,\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2 proceedings [1] - 34:6 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 2:2 process [12] - 5:1, 5:3, 6:12, 7:9, 7:12, 8:4, 8:7, 9:23, 10:11, 11:16, 18:3, 27:22 processes [1] - 11:20 produce [4] - 14:24, 18:8, 19:2, 20:1 produced [2] - 17:9, 19:21 producing [1] - 21:20	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$
6:21, 7:17, 17:4, 19:11, 20:22, 28:18, 31:9, 32:1 principal [1] - 30:7 private [1] - 14:14 problem [1] - 24:20 proceeding [2] - 7:23, 22:2 proceedings [1] - 34:6 PROCEEDINGS [1] - 2:2 process [12] - 5:1, 5:3, 6:12, 7:9, 7:12, 8:4, 8:7, 9:23, 10:11, 11:16, 18:3, 27:22 produce [4] - 14:24, 18:8, 19:2, 20:1 produce [2] - 17:9, 19:21 producing [1] - 21:20 product [1] - 30:18 production [2] -	$\label{eq:product} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{quite} [1] - 13:3 \\ \hline \textbf{R} \\ \hline \textbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, \\ 23:1, 26:3, 26:5 \\ \hline \textbf{RALPH} [1] - 1:10 \\ \hline \textbf{range} [3] - 15:6, 15:8, \\ 16:24 \\ \hline \textbf{rapidly} [1] - 10:24 \\ \hline \textbf{rather} [2] - 6:4, 12:3 \\ \hline \textbf{reaction} [1] - 15:20 \\ \hline \textbf{read} [1] - 15:19 \\ \hline \textbf{ready} [2] - 6:1, 7:2 \\ \hline \textbf{reasonable} [4] - \\ 14:23, 17:19, 19:1, \\ 21:7 \\ \hline \textbf{reassemble} [1] - \\ 15:15 \\ \hline \textbf{received} [2] - 15:12, \\ 17:10 \\ \hline \textbf{recently} [2] - 16:11, \\ 25:4 \\ \end{array} \right.$
$\begin{array}{c} 6:21,7:17,17:4,\\ 19:11,20:22,28:18,\\ 31:9,32:1\\ \\ \textbf{principal}[1]-30:7\\ \\ \textbf{private}[1]-14:14\\ \\ \textbf{problem}[1]-24:20\\ \\ \textbf{proceeding}[2]-7:23,\\ 22:2\\ \\ \textbf{proceedings}[1]-34:6\\ \\ \textbf{PROCEEDINGS}[1]-\\ 2:2\\ \\ \textbf{process}[12]-5:1,5:3,\\ 6:12,7:9,7:12,8:4,\\ 8:7,9:23,10:11,\\ 11:16,18:3,27:22\\ \\ \textbf{produce}[4]-14:24,\\ 18:8,19:2,20:1\\ \\ \textbf{produce}[4]-14:24,\\ 18:8,19:2,20:1\\ \\ \textbf{produce}[2]-17:9,\\ 19:21\\ \\ \textbf{producing}[1]-21:20\\ \\ \textbf{product}[1]-30:18\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \mathbf{R} \\ \hline \mathbf{raised} [4] - 12:15, $$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$$

recognizes [2] -10:13, 28:9 recommended [1] -11:7 reduce [1] - 26:10 reduced [3] - 16:19, 26:8, 30:6 reduction [1] - 26:19 references [1] - 29:23 referring [1] - 3:14 reflect [1] - 12:5

12:12, 12:21, 17:3, 19:9, 20:24, 22:21, 22:24, 23:5, 24:8, 28:19, 31:7, 32:19, 32:21, 32:24, 33:1, 33:4, 33:5 MS [1] - 3:4 multiple [1] - 24:11 Ν name [3] - 3:13, 10:20, 23:12 named [3] - 3:16, 13:11, 34:9 names [4] - 5:11, 5:15, 5:20, 28:16 narrow [5] - 17:14, 17:19, 18:9, 18:20, 24:15 narrowed [5] - 14:6, 18:24, 21:21, 25:4, 25.5narrowly [2] - 13:23, 16:17 nature [1] - 25:25 nearly [1] - 25:13 need [2] - 13:7, 16:18 needs [2] - 28:4, 28:13 never [1] - 8:24 new [1] - 31:12 next [5] - 6:17, 12:5, 22:15, 32:12, 32:13 **NOAA** [1] - 31:22 Notary [3] - 1:14, 34:2, 34:15 note [2] - 20:24, 22:7 notes [1] - 34:5 notice [1] - 28:8 notices [2] - 17:11, 28:10 novel [1] - 26:2 November [1] - 18:13 number [8] - 19:2, 21:10, 23:3, 24:4, 27:5, 27:12, 27:16, 28:2 numbers [2] - 14:20, 14:21 nutrient [3] - 26:8, 26:19, 27:7 nutrients [1] - 26:1 0 objections [1] - 17:20 obtain [1] - 9:6 obtained [1] - 23:11 obviously [1] - 11:4

occurred [1] - 27:17 **OF** [3] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:6 offered [1] - 13:13 offices [1] - 1:10 once [3] - 6:2, 6:8, 18:24 one [18] - 5:21, 5:25, 8:13, 8:15, 8:21, 8:22, 10:16, 13:10, 14:9, 21:14, 22:1, 23:13, 23:14, 25:8, 29:20, 30:4, 30:7 ones [1] - 18:16 ongoing [2] - 4:4, 18:3 open [1] - 11:17 opinion [1] - 8:22 **opportunity** [1] - 5:16 optimal [1] - 25:23 options [1] - 9:23 order [3] - 9:10, 12:24, 22:19 ordered [1] - 12:24 organically [1] - 11:19 original [1] - 17:6 Original [1] - 1:1 Os [1] - 2:20 OSVALDO [1] - 1:17 otherwise [1] - 8:24 outcome [1] - 34:8 outset [3] - 19:12, 27:23. 31:14 outside [4] - 7:8, 8:1, 8:18, 8:23 overall [1] - 29:15 overbroad [1] - 28:10 overemphasize [1] -32:9 overstated [1] - 21:23 overview [1] - 11:1 own [1] - 10:21 oyster [1] - 25:12 oysters [2] - 26:16, 29:22 Ρ page [2] - 25:10, 26:6 pages [1] - 34:4 papers [1] - 31:13 paragraph [2] - 26:4, 26:7 part [8] - 4:14, 10:8, 10:9, 10:16, 20:23, 21:6, 25:1, 25:24 particular [2] - 16:3, 23:15 parties [7] - 5:10, 7:24, 10:25, 11:4, 12:6, 12:18, 17:7 partnership [1] -

13:19 parts [1] - 15:14 party [1] - 30:17 party's [2] - 28:13, 30:18 past [1] - 3:15 patent [1] - 30:21 path [1] - 30:13 pending [1] - 23:8 people [8] - 3:13, 5:16, 5:21, 6:12, 11:11, 11:21, 15:6, 29:1 PERRY [17] - 1:16, 2:5, 2:13, 2:23, 4:23, 6:19, 7:11, 9:21, 12:12, 12:21, 19:9, 22:21, 24:8, 31:7, 32:19, 32:24, 33:4 perry [1] - 29:12 **Perry** [13] - 2:13, 2:21, 5:22, 6:19, 7:3, 10:16, 17:17, 18:22, 19:10, 22:21, 29:4, 30:5, 31:4 Perry's [3] - 18:24, 28:20, 28:23 person [7] - 3:16, 6:5, 6:12, 8:21, 11:12, 25:6, 34:8 person's [1] - 11:3 personal [2] - 18:12, 20:8 perspective [1] - 7:5 **Phil** [4] - 2:13, 6:19, 19:10, 22:21 **PHILIP** [1] - 1:16 phone [2] - 6:4, 6:8 phytoplankton [1] -26:23 Pierce [1] - 1:10 pivoted [1] - 25:10 place [1] - 6:17 Plaintiff [1] - 1:4 planning [1] - 13:22 Planning [1] - 15:25 plant [1] - 25:14 plants [1] - 30:23 pleased [1] - 9:15 point [8] - 6:10, 6:13, 11:6, 11:18, 15:13, 20:20, 22:11, 25:8 pointed [1] - 16:13 points [1] - 27:5 Policy [1] - 16:1 portion [1] - 14:16 Portland [1] - 1:12 position [1] - 29:21 tontial m THE REPORTING

nromnt [1] - 32:10 GROUP **sed** [2] - 5:11, Mason & Lockhart

occur [1] - 27:18

39

reflected [1] - 18:6	ruling [1] - 17:12	side [1] - 8:21	8:19	13:23, 14:2, 14:6,
regard [3] - 18:17,	run [2] - 14:2, 21:3	sides [1] - 5:15	status [8] - 12:5,	16:12, 16:14, 16:17,
21:9, 23:14		similar [2] - 14:21,	17:25, 22:15, 25:9,	17:18, 18:9, 18:16,
regarding [1] - 27:3	S	16:5	28:2, 30:16, 32:13,	18:22, 18:25, 21:1,
regularly [1] - 24:2	3	simply [2] - 20:24,	32:23	23:18
regulatory [1] - 31:24	salinities [1] - 26:1	30:1	stenographic [1] -	testify [1] - 23:23
	salinity [4] - 25:23,		34:5	testimony [8] - 24:20,
rehash [1] - 21:13	26:9, 26:18, 27:6	situation [1] - 19:25		24:23, 27:2, 27:21,
relevance [1] - 15:17	satisfied [1] - 27:15	smaller [1] - 25:23	step [2] - 10:23, 11:8	27:25, 28:22, 29:9,
relevant [3] - 15:3,	saw [1] - 24:14	smelt [1] - 31:21	steps [1] - 5:25	30:20
15:8, 15:24	schedule [4] - 10:3,	sometimes [2] -	still [4] - 14:18, 23:18,	
remaining [1] - 27:20	20:11, 20:16, 25:6	11:19, 28:10	24:5, 25:22	THE [1] - 1:1
remark [1] - 25:8	scheduled [3] - 24:4,	soon [7] - 8:9, 16:8,	Street [1] - 1:11	theories [2] - 31:17,
remind [1] - 4:13	24:10, 27:19	16:15, 20:5, 20:14,	strict [1] - 20:11	31:23
reminds [1] - 20:10	scheduling [1] - 32:11	20:18, 28:15	structure [1] - 26:20	thereafter [1] - 10:4
repeat [1] - 4:5	scientifically [1] -	sooner [1] - 7:6	studied [1] - 30:11	thoughts [1] - 4:3
replay [1] - 22:1	31:18	sorry [1] - 8:13	study [1] - 29:2	three [1] - 13:8
report [9] - 12:5,	scope [3] - 16:12,	sort [1] - 27:7	subject [3] - 4:3, 18:9,	thrust [1] - 29:14
12:15, 17:25, 18:6,	23:18, 28:7	sought [2] - 29:7, 29:9	22:9	Thursday [1] - 18:5
22:14, 25:9, 28:2,	search [15] - 13:13,	sounds [1] - 30:13	subpart [1] - 27:15	timing [1] - 12:7
30:16, 32:13		source [1] - 24:1	subpoena [3] - 12:17,	today [1] - 2:22
reporter [1] - 2:10	13:23, 14:2, 14:5, 14:10, 16:12, 16:14	SPECIAL [36] - 1:9,	17:10, 27:13	together [1] - 10:25
reports [6] - 3:24,	14:19, 16:12, 16:14, 16:16, 17:18, 18:0	2:3, 2:6, 2:17, 2:21,	subscribe [1] - 34:10	topic [3] - 6:24, 23:14,
4:12, 4:17, 21:16,	16:16, 17:18, 18:9, 18:16, 18:22, 18:25,	2:24, 3:7, 3:17, 3:23,	subset [1] - 14:7	32:6
22:10, 32:23		4:9, 5:5, 6:3, 6:16,	success [2] - 10:5,	topics [16] - 23:3,
representative [1] -	21:1, 21:21	7:1, 7:7, 7:20, 8:10,	10:10	23:12, 23:15, 23:20,
31:1	search-term-	8:16, 10:14, 11:24,	suffering [1] - 26:17	23:24, 24:11, 24:14,
representatives [1] -	narrowed [1] - 21:21	12:10, 12:13, 17:2,	sufficiently [1] - 20:14	24:16, 24:18, 25:2,
8:19	second [1] - 14:9	19:7, 20:22, 22:4,	suggest [6] - 8:17,	25:4, 25:5, 27:20,
represented [1] -	secondly [1] - 12:4	22:23, 22:25, 24:7,	9:2, 9:4, 9:11, 21:5,	29:8, 29:10
19:19	sections [1] - 4:12	28:18, 31:4, 32:8,	22:13	totally [1] - 30:16
reputable [1] - 5:18	secure [2] - 11:8, 23:9	32:20, 32:22, 32:25,	suggested [1] - 18:1	towards [1] - 8:6
request [1] - 30:20	see [3] - 10:2, 32:3	33:2	suggesting [1] - 32:2	transcript [3] - 4:15,
required [1] - 5:2	seek [3] - 12:16,	species [7] - 25:14,	suggestion [2] - 9:9,	21:12, 34:5
resolution [2] - 22:18,	12:22, 27:2	26:21, 26:22, 27:4,	10:7	transcripts [1] - 22:11
28:4	seeking [5] - 15:6,	27:5, 29:18, 29:23	suggestions [2] -	transparent [1] -
resolved [2] - 8:9,	15:23, 17:16, 29:6,	specific [2] - 13:15,	10:18, 12:2	18:21
22:17	30:18	31:3	superior [1] - 11:5	trial [1] - 12:23
respect [2] - 20:4,	seem [1] - 24:5	specifically [3] - 13:6,	supervisor [1] - 13:12	true [1] - 21:10
20:7	select [2] - 8:15, 9:5	16:2, 16:20	supply [1] - 27:10	try [4] - 9:13, 18:20,
respond [2] - 19:10,	selected [1] - 6:9	specifications [1] -	support [1] - 29:3	21:7, 23:17
20:23	selecting [1] - 5:21	27:13	SUPREME [1] - 1:1	trying [9] - 5:20, 10:9,
responding [2] - 4:16,	selection [4] - 5:4,	speed [2] - 11:13,	surprise [1] - 4:11	17:18, 20:12, 23:6,
18:2	6:6, 6:23, 8:7	16:10	surprised [1] - 17:24	23:9, 27:22, 30:1,
response [1] - 17:9	sense [1] - 7:11	spent [1] - 13:1	suspects [1] - 2:7	30:8
responses [2] - 26:13,	separate [1] - 18:11	spoken [1] - 3:15	switch [1] - 11:25	turn [1] - 12:14
27:9	September [1] - 23:7	spokesperson [3] -	Switch [1] = 11.20	two [7] - 3:13, 11:24,
responsive [1] - 19:4	serious [1] - 17:20	2:22, 3:8, 3:11	Т	14:2, 15:22, 21:11,
result [1] - 20:6	serve [1] - 28:12	standing [1] - 25:11	I	21:24, 24:9
results [2] - 14:19,	served [1] - 23:7	stands [2] - 4:6, 6:1	tailor [1] - 13:7	type [3] - 26:17, 30:19,
19:1	Service [1] - 31:19	start [2] - 2:11, 4:9	talented [1] - 9:3	31:23
retired [1] - 16:4	sessions [1] - 10:3	state [4] - 9:4, 13:22,	taught [1] - 13:3	types [1] - 31:20
review [4] - 19:2,	set [1] - 9:19	30:11, 31:2	team [1] - 3:14	
	sets [1] - 21:21	STATE [2] - 1:3, 1:6	Tech [5] - 14:5, 14:22,	U
21:12, 22:11, 29:13	settlement [1] - 4:11	State [8] - 1:14, 1:16,	18:10, 18:16, 20:4	_
reviewing [1] - 18:7	several [2] - 14:13,	1:18, 3:1, 13:19,	tecum [1] - 17:10	U.S [1] - 31:19
revised [1] - 23:17	23:8	15:24, 29:2, 34:3	tee [1] - 21:15	U.S.A _[1] - 1:20
ripe [1] - 22:17	share [2] - 12:1, 19:13	statements [1] - 17:25	telephone [3] - 1:9,	unassembled [1] -
River [1] - 16:3	shortly [1] - 5:10	States [2] - 3:19, 3:22	6:14, 33:6	15:13
RMR [1] - 1:13	shown [1] - 15:16	States [2] - 5.19, 5.22 STΔTES [4] - 1.1	term [1] - 21:21	under [1] - 32:17
road [1] - 10:2			ROUP [15] - 6:6, 13:13,	underlying [3] - 24:21,
	.	8		
L	N N	lason & Lockha	rt	

- Mason & Lockhart -----

Y yield [1] - 13:24 yielding [1] - 18:22 Z zooplankton [1] - 26:23