1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
3	
4	
5	PATRICK JOSEPH TURNER, ET AL * Docket 05-CV-4206-L
6	* and Consolidated Cases versus *
7	* April 6, 2006, 9:00 a.m. MURPHY OIL USA, INC. * * New Orleans Louisiana
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * New Orleans, Louisiana
9	
10	STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE
11	HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12 13	<u>APPEARANCES</u> :
14 15 16	For the Plaintiffs: Law Offices of Sidney D. Torres III BY: SIDNEY D. TORRES III, ESQ. 1290 7th Street Slidell, Louisiana 70458
17	For the Defendant: Frilot Partridge Kohnke & Clements
18	BY: KERRY J. MILLER, ESQ. 1100 Poydras Street, Suite 3600 New Orleans, Louisiana 70163
19	Hen of realist, Louis rana roles
20	Official Court Reporter: Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR 500 Poydras Street, Room B-406
21	New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 (504) 589-7778
22	
23	
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
25	produced by computer.

PROCEEDINGS

(April 6, 2006)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise.

THE COURT: Be seated. Call the case.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 05-4206, Patrick Joseph Turner, et al versus Murphy Oil USA.

THE COURT: Counsel, make your appearance for the record.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, Sidney Torres on behalf of the plaintiffs.

MR. KROUSE: A.J. Krouse and Danny Dysart. I believe Kerry Miller and George Frilot, on behalf of Murphy Oil, will be here shortly.

THE COURT: We are here in the monthly status conference. I met a moment ago with liaison counsel and members of the committees to discuss the agenda. They have given me an agenda. I will take it in order. First we'll hear from the plaintiffs, No. 6, revisit the common benefit set-aside issue in light of Murphy's expanded settlement program.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, when the common benefit plan was set in place, it was always envisioned that what we were talking about is covering the individuals in the Murphy footprint settlement area, people that would have made settlements regardless of the class certification. What we

have now is Murphy is going beyond that footprint and settling with people who are within the Court-certified area, but outside of that footprint and in the future may be settling with people even beyond the Court-certified area.

It is our position that at certification the defendants took a very strong position that the Murphy footprint was it. They not only had done the primary testing in that area, the vast majority of the testing in that area, but they also had hydrologists and experts who spoke about topography and hydrology and why it couldn't go beyond this area, the water wasn't high enough, there were barriers, et cetera. We feel that now we are talking about a different category. As we pointed out to Your Honor this morning, we will bring before the Court a motion to expand Your Honor's ruling.

THE COURT: Let's not do that. This is your motion.

I'll hear your argument. Let me hear from the defendant.

What's your position on this motion to modify?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, this would be the motion to modify the set-aside ruling or the class certification?

THE COURT: Modify the set-aside ruling.

MR. MILLER: Yes, Your Honor. We would certainly oppose that. We are abiding by Your Honor's previous ruling such that when any claimant comes in and settles with Murphy and has a relationship with an attorney, we have created

procedures whereby the appropriate 10 and 2 percent set-aside are being created and set forth in a separate fund. What Mr. Torres is talking about are settlements that Murphy is undertaking with people who are not represented by attorneys. We think that is something that plaintiffs don't have a right to, any type of set-aside common benefit from that type of activity. These people are opting out. By opting out, they are opting out of the class action and they are pursuing a settlement on their own behalf.

Now, the area in which Murphy has expanded is a very small area, Your Honor. Murphy's original settlement area covered around 3,000 houses. The Court's area is around 6,000 houses. What Murphy has done is it is agreeing to settle with people who are within the EPA area that was not within Murphy's. We spent a lot of time at the class certification hearing -- and I think Your Honor's ruling on class certification reflects that the EPA area and the Murphy area are very similar. The EPA area only contains an additional 600 houses that are not in the Murphy area. Of these 600, approximately 100 had already tested positive and settled to begin with. So you are only left with a population of about 500 people who Murphy is expanding an offer of settlement to regardless of whether they test positive.

I think we explained in great detail in our papers and at the hearing that Murphy's position has always

been you can qualify for a settlement if you are beyond the Murphy settlement area, but if you test positive. That is still Murphy's position with one small caveat; that is, if you are within EPA, but not within Murphy, then you can qualify. We know that only pertains to about 500 residences. That's being done because of the EPA criteria and not because of anything that has been done by the plaintiff lawyers.

THE COURT: Do you want to respond?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor. If I may, if Your Honor does expand the common benefit, I would like to ask the opportunity to address the amount, Your Honor, because it's a little different category. When we were within their footprint, we were envisioning that if people did it on their own there would be no charge for attorney's fees or costs, and if they had an attorney the 10 percent envisioned that would be because they had an attorney. As we go outside of that area, we have to bring up the fact we are now talking about what would be the fair assessment of an attorney's fee because we are talking about an area representing the class. It's not just the 10 percent and the 2 percent set-aside. We would like the opportunity to address what we feel would be the appropriate attorney's fees and costs to assess outside of the area that previously the set-aside had encompassed.

THE COURT: I have before me a motion to modify the set-aside. The Court has ruled on the set-aside. The purpose

of the set-aside is to ensure that work is being done for the parties and also that the people who are within a certain area and profit from the work pay for the work at an appropriate amount.

When I looked at this initially, I felt that the people within the area that the Court had set encompassed not only the Murphy area, but also the EPA area. My feeling was that the people within the area Murphy had indicated from the outset that they were willing to settle with ought not to pay a tariff. Even before any claims were filed, Murphy was there indicating that they were interested in resolving the matter and offering some plan that people could partake of. It was my understanding that Murphy was limiting their approach to that particular area. It seemed to me it was appropriate not to impose a tariff on those individuals. I did not perceive of the people who were outside of that initial area as covered by it, so I do feel that modification is in order.

I don't need any assistance on the amounts. I think that they ought to pay a tariff for attorney's fees and also costs. If they don't have a lawyer, then that might well be reflected on a lower amount because they're going to have to pay as opposed to paying counsel. I do think it's inappropriate for people who are outside of Murphy's footprint to pay something because they have gotten some benefit.

Murphy now has expanded their footprint.

Whether they did it because of the EPA or because of the class certification hearing, I feel that it's because of the class certification hearing. The EPA preceded the class certification hearing. I will issue a modification order in that regard.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, may I ask you to certify that ruling under 1292(b)? These people specifically are opting out not to have counsel, yet they are being forced to pay counsel fees for counsel they don't want to have in the first place.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll consider that.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's go to the next area.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, on the discovery problems, I think we discussed that there's a time next week which we will report back to the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's put that on the record. What's the discovery problem?

MR. TORRES: Mr. Bruno, Your Honor, will address that.

MR. BRUNO: Your Honor, there are just two issues, first with regard to delay by which the defendants will respond to our previously submitted discovery requests, and the second regards subject matters which they believe are not discoverable at this time. We served a 30(b)(6) some weeks ago. They have

indicated to us we will not see any production until the 17th of April. I think we have agreed that on Monday defense counsel and plaintiff counsel will meet first to go through the entire request to ascertain if there are areas which are vague. We will certainly define and narrow to the extent that we can. The defendants will produce documents that they have on a rolling basis once they get them. Finally, anything that we can't resolve on Monday will be the subject of a motion to compel, which I'm loathe to do, but if that's what we need to do I'll do it.

THE COURT: Both sides need to recognize that from the defendant's standpoint they can't be asked to produce the It's just impossible for them. From your standpoint, I world. understand when you get into the case you don't know exactly the specifics, so you make it broader, but you all are now into the case. You have got to be able to talk and tell defense counsel, "Look, this is the limited area that I see that's important." If you need another area, then ask for another area later on. If you ask for the world in the beginning, you are going to get nothing. At this point, you have got to be a little more specific. From the defense counsel standpoint, they are going to give it to you on a rolling basis, but you have to understand that they are going to give you what they have got. They may get something later on and they will give you that. It's not that they are withholding; it's just that

they don't have it yet. Both sides have to understand the situation.

MR. KROUSE: Your Honor, I just want to address the issue. A.J. Krouse. I want the record to reflect that Murphy did receive a draft of a 30(b)(6) notice. As I explained to the Court, that notice contains 50 requests for production of documents. Some of the documents have been produced during the course of the class certification hearing to date. One of our tasks, as Joe has asked us to do, is literally pigeonhole the documents that have been produced by Bates number and/or exhibit number into the request for production of documents. It's time-consuming.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. KROUSE: We are endeavoring to do that. I will move up the date. I can meet with Joe this morning, after this hearing, or any time this afternoon before 3:00.

THE COURT: My instinct on this one is that you just need to communicate. I don't see this as a problem. I just see it as a communication situation. Let's take the opportunity to communicate and, rather than file a bunch of papers, just talk to each over. Then if you have a problem, get to me and I'll resolve it. What's next?

MR. TORRES: Item 2, distribution of property test results to class members. We had discussed that with Your Honor. It's my understanding that the defendants will

provide that information to us and we will distribute it to the class members.

THE COURT: Yes. The defendants have made a bargain, so to speak, with the class members saying, "If you allow us to come on your premises and test your premises, you're going to get the results." I think the homeowners are interested in getting the results. From the standpoint of Murphy, that's what they said they would do. So the individual homeowners need to get that material. On the other hand, we have these individuals who are represented until they opt out -- if they ever opt out -- so the Court is concerned about who sends it. The way to do it is to get the material from Murphy to the plaintiff class counsel and the class counsel will forward it to the individual homeowners.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I think time is of the essence on this issue. These people are entitled to the test results. These are all tests that were ordered before the class was certified, so we are talking about January 30. What I would like to do today, if we could, is resolve the manner in which these results are going to be disseminated.

I presented a form letter to you and to Mr. Torres in chambers before the hearing. If Your Honor or Mr. Torres wants any revisions, please let me know. We are happy to make the revisions, send them to Mr. Torres in whatever fashion he wants, put them in envelopes, put stamps on

them, put the envelopes on the outside, whatever it takes to go ahead and get these results out quickly.

THE COURT: You and Mr. Torres talk. Let me hear from you today as to whether or not you can agree. If you can't, then I will draft the letter.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, Mr. Lambert actually has some comments at this time. Would you like us to reserve until we look at the letter?

THE COURT: Let's get in on this discussion, then draft a letter or whatever you need. If you can't agree, give it to me and I'll draft the letter.

MR. LAMBERT: Comments?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. LAMBERT: With regard to the testing, as we briefly discussed, we believe that scrape sampling bias, meaning looking for the oil, is appropriate as reflected in the EPA sampling guidelines. The defendants have a company which is using the composite sampling technique, which we think greatly dilutes the sample. We think that those sample results, they are not just a number, there's an explanation that needs to go along with them, and that's what we will be discussing. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TORRES: Item 3, ensuring that the written notice is sent to people who request hard copies of notice from

Murphy, Mr. Miller has confirmed he spoke to Jay Andry and that is being done.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, on the issue of notice of the letter that was sent by plaintiffs' counsel preceding the notice to all members of the class explaining the "Disadvantages If You Opt Out," I would like to make a motion at this point for contempt against the proponents of this particular notice and go ahead and argue that motion if the Court will allow.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, the Court certified a class on January 30, 2006. Right after that, we all recognized the first order of business was to create a notice that will be promulgated to the members of the class. In early February, the parties submitted respective notice drafts to the Court. I believe on February 4 the Court issued an order drafting and containing a class notice preceded by six or seven pages of ruling on the notice. So there was a written notice that was to go out. It explained rights and other things about the case and also how class members could go about opting out.

Now, in connection with the text of the notice, there was also I think a joint submission on the notice plan. Item 1 on the notice plan was that notice would be sent by mail to all 6,000 residences in the class certification areas. What we have found out, Your Honor, is despite the fact that that

was done in early February -- we are now April 6 -- the Court notice has not gone out. We have all spoken about the sanctity of the Court notice. The Court has asked both sides not to comment on it or editorialize it, just present it as is. What we found out is that the official Court notice has not gone out by mail to the 6,000 residences, but the plaintiffs have seen fit to send out to the 6,000 residences this one-page document saying "Disadvantages If You Opt Out." I will read certain portions in the letter:

"The settlements Murphy is offering are unfair and do not account for loss of property value, mental distress, or possible long and short-term health effects from exposure to the pollution. Do not let Murphy divide the citizens of St. Bernard whose lives have been devastated by the oil spill. If you are a member of the class, you will remain a member unless you opt out. We urge you to remain a member, protect your rights, and help rebuild St. Bernard."

This is what went out before the official Court notice. It has the effect of chilling the notice, negating the effect of the notice. A layman gets this one-page document last week and reads it and then two weeks later he gets a four-page document, official Court notice. He is going to say, "I have already read about this. I shouldn't opt out. I've been advised not to opt out." So it's negated the whole effect of the notice.

In fact, the main problem with the notice, if Your Honor will recall, the plaintiffs' initial proposal was to only do notice by mail. So the whole mail-out notice has been negated, Your Honor, and we think that's unfair and in contempt of this Court's notice ruling and subsequent comments about the sanctity of the notice, which Murphy has respected, Your Honor.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, first, let me say that we represent the class, and Your Honor has recognized the fact that we have the right to communicate with the class. I would like to discuss a little bit of the history here because when we are talking about a mail-out in this case, we are talking about a challenge because people are all over the place. First, I would like to say that there are poster boards that have been placed in public places. There's been the advertisement in the newspaper. In addition to the 2,000 people who have settled, there's been 1,000 people who have opted out.

We thought in the beginning that we could use the list that Murphy had in order for the mail-out to get out quickly. It turned out that list was extremely deficient in number. Mr. Jay Andry had worked on that with Kerry Miller. We talked to the experts that we had in the case who were helping us to make sure that we were meeting the requirements of due process. It turned out that we couldn't get from the defendants -- we thought they had the tax roll list. They may

or may not have that, but for whatever reason they couldn't share it with us. So we had to go to Baton Rouge and we got the tax roll list, which encompasses approximately 6,000 people, which we all agree is approximately the number of people in that area. We had been working on that diligently, trying to get that in a format where we could have the mail-out.

Your Honor, the defendants have spent millions and millions of dollars in their settlement program encouraging people to opt out. I have to tell you, it's like if you test positive, go see Murphy, you are going to get money in the case, and the settlement program has been hugely successful. We, as class counsel for these folks, have not only the right, but the duty to start educating them on what their rights are to opting out.

I suggest, when we talk about the sanctity of the notice, the defendants at first -- when calls were going into them, that since we represented these folks they should no longer be in a position to say, "Well, look, there's an opt-out notice. This is what you need to do." As it turns out and as I pointed out to Your Honor, many of these opt-out notices are coming in on a form. There's a printed form saying, "In order to avoid any appearance of impropriety." It turns out that's a form that was drafted by Murphy and that they're handing out at their settlement trailer. When people go in, I don't know what

communication, if any, they are having there, but people are coming in and signing those and sending them to us.

I think the most important thing here, Your Honor, is the fact that we have diligently worked on getting this notice out. Obviously, the method that we have right now is working quite well because people are finding out about it. The other opt-out notice I think is definitely going out this week, so it hasn't been purposely delayed. The letter itself is something that we have the perfect right to do, to explain to people what we think their rights are, and if they choose to opt out that's their decision. When we were appointed class counsel, I think Your Honor acknowledged that we had the right to communicate with these folks.

MR. ANDRY: Gerald Andry Jr. on behalf of the plaintiffs, Your Honor. A couple of points. One of the things that we originally agreed to with the defendants was that we were going to follow a specific pattern of attempting to find out the exact addresses of the people before we sent out the notice. That process includes sending all the addresses through the National Change of Address Database and also doing some individual research through the Parish of St. Bernard's website.

When we mailed out our letters to the clients that we could mail them out to -- that letter went out just a matter of two days ago -- we did not go through all those

procedures. We did a mass "hope" mailing to see if it will get to some people, but we don't know who it was going to get to. The purpose of the notice that the Court prepared was to get it to everyone in the class and to do it as completely and as diligently as possible. We were two days behind our letter running the process through the National Change of Address Database, checking as many of the addresses we could. The mailing went out Wednesday, which was yesterday, and we think that we have a complete mailing. We also have a procedure on what happens if any of those letters come back as to diligently get them the opt-out mailing.

The information that we got from the defendants, when they are talking about in February, about mailing out to everybody, out of the 3,000 plus names that they gave us that had not opted out or had not settled, only 1,300 of those had addresses. I called Mr. Miller and I asked him specifically, "Is it only 1,300 that you really have addresses for," and then we had to start from square one. I then asked him for all the information on all 6,000 people. He wasn't able to give me that or didn't give me that. I never got a response. So we went and got the information ourselves and started the process over in order to follow the plan that we had put with the Court through Mr. Hilsee, and that's our position.

MR. MILLER: Just briefly, I would like to introduce into evidence in support of my motion the "Disadvantages If You

Opt Out" letter that was sent to Mr. Danny Dysart, who lives within the Court-certified area. Exhibit 1 will be "Disadvantages If You Opt Out." Exhibit 2 will be the envelope that the letter came in. I want to note for the Court's reference that the envelope is addressed to "Daniel L. Dysart, 513 South Dilton Street, New Orleans, Louisiana." That obviously was not his address in the affected area. That was 3512 Shilona.

What Mr. Andry was talking about -- and it's really here nor there. You have two things in order to send out a notice. You have the notice document itself and you have a list of addresses. The fact is they have the list of addresses. They got some from me, some from the U.S. Postal Service, some from the tax rolls. They have that list. They have the notice. The notice has been in effect since February 4. They chose to send this letter out first when they could have easily sent the notice out first. In fact, we all know the notice was prepared before this letter was prepared, so it was intentional. It was done to chill the effect of the official Court notice.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. TORRES: May I have further comment?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TORRES: First of all, as Your Honor is well aware, this was sprung on us this morning. If necessary, we

would like for the opportunity at least to brief our obligation to communicate with our clients as class members. I would just like to say, also, Your Honor, in this case, as we go forward, the communication with our clients is extremely important, not so they understand their rights just to what compensation they may be entitled to or not entitled to, but as this Court is aware our position is very strong that a large part of this settlement program is for Murphy to get off the hook on a cleanup. We feel that it's extremely important for the community to understand, when they go in to receive money from Murphy, that what we have turned up, as their attorneys in this case, is that there's a strong, very big issue as to how that's being done at the end of the day, when we're standing down in that community a year from now, as to whether or not it's been cleaned up proper. So we feel we have every right to communicate with the clients.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As I said, Your Honor, the discussion we had about the mailings with Your Honor, we have certainly made every attempt to respect that. It was not in the form of a Court order. Anything Your Honor says, whether it be in chambers or out here, we treat it as it is a Court order. I think actually for a contempt order to issue there would need to be a violation of a specific order of the Court.

THE COURT: I understand the issue. I have before me a motion for contempt of Court. There's two issues here, the

legal position and the professional position. After the class certification and after class counsel was designated as representing the individuals, it was my understanding that both sides understood that the first order of business would be to notify these individuals that they were within a class and what their rights were. After that notice was gone over, then the parties could discuss the notice because I anticipated individuals would be calling their class counsel and saying, "What's the situation," or calling other attorneys and saying, "What are my rights?" That's what we told them to do.

The proper approach, in my opinion, would have been for the notice to go out first and then for the attorneys to explain the significance of the notice. I can understand the defendant's position and their disappointment to see potential class members receive a letter speaking about a notice that the individuals haven't received yet. I join in their disappointment. On the other hand, technically, the plaintiffs are right. They represent the individuals as the representing attorney and they have a right to communicate with the individuals.

I also understand that notices have been posted on the courthouse door or have been posted in public areas. I also have seen in the newspaper on a Sunday for two or three weeks a full page ad with the entire Court notice. I also am aware that Murphy long before this litigation came into being

was communicating -- as was their right, nothing improper about it, but the fact of the matter is that they were communicating with the individuals within what they felt was the footprint.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Court doesn't write on a clean slate here. There's a lot of issues. I'm denying the motion for contempt, but I tell the plaintiff attorneys that I'm disappointed that a letter would go out before the Court's notice went out. not my understanding of what was going to happen. The reason I have told both sides to feel they have easy access to me is so that I can deal with these problems before they come up. you are going to take some position, run it past me first and I'll give you my read on it. I don't want to see these things come up after the fact because it's hard for me to unring that bell. Technically, you're not in violation of a Court order. Technically, it's not contempt because they're your clients and communicating with your clients is your right, but I'm disappointed that you would write them first before they got a notice. Let's go to the next item.

MR. TORRES: Your Honor, may we clear one other thing up on that issue that was just brought up this morning? The fact that Murphy at their settlement trailer would be giving out a form that allows people to opt out, I just question if there's any communication going on at that point for people to receive that document.

THE COURT: I don't want any communication being

made. The only people that can communicate with these people now are the attorneys. If people have any questions, they direct them to the class counsel. It's my understanding that's what Murphy is doing.

MR. MILLER: That's been Murphy's position,

Your Honor. We do not speak with people until they opt out.

THE COURT: What's the next item on the agenda? I think maybe we have covered all the plaintiffs'.

MR. TORRES: Mr. Bruno, when he was discussing the ongoing run of discovery, not waiting until everything is concluded, we had discussed receiving on a very timely basis the test results from Murphy, as well as updated information on the settlement program. We discussed that, Your Honor, in the context of asking the Court and determining the proper method to go forward to expand the class. I would like to ask if we could do that to the extent that Mr. Miller can, on a weekly basis, keep us advised of the test results and the settlement information. That would be helpful so we can report to Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think that's reasonable.

MR. MILLER: We have been doing that and will continue to report that information.

THE COURT: Let me return to an item that was covered before that you folks are going to talk about and that is getting the test results to the class people and also a comment

on the test results. If there's a disagreement on the comment situation, it may well have to be in two letters so that it doesn't send the results and then say, "What we are sending you is bad." If you can't agree on a letter, have two letters. "You have received such-and-such. This is what our complaints are," whatever it is, as opposed to one letter. That's an option.

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I'm going to hand to you now the draft of the Murphy letter. They can look at it and get back with me this afternoon so we can report to the Court.

THE COURT: From the defendant's standpoint, do you need to cover anything we haven't covered?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I think the things that remain on the defendant's side were covered in chambers. An agreement was reached. We were just noting to the Court the LDEQ's intervention regarding groundwater contamination. I had been called by an attorney from the state attorney general's office to waive service and I agreed to do that. That's what prompted me to put it on the agenda.

The last item on the defendant's items is the production of data from the public domain. We have a discovery plan in place. It has some protocols for production of documents. There is not a specific protocol on production of documents from the public domain, but given the circumstances that we are under there is a tremendous amount of documentation

that the government is producing that is publicly available. We would like, given the time frames that we are operating under, to be able to produce that without having to wait on responses before they request to go ahead and do a formal production. It's going to be considered authentic by the Court and by the other side.

THE COURT: That's important to work out. I don't really want any 901 problems with authenticity if it's a public domain thing. We have to shortcut it.

MR. TORRES: Yes, Your Honor. Finally, on the LDEQ, I want to note that there are representatives of the LDEQ here today that participated in the conference.

THE COURT: Let me hear from those representatives, please, Counsel. Tell us what the situation is. Would you approach the podium, please, sir. For the record, tell us who you are and what your intentions are.

MR. ROBINSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Herman Robinson, the executive counsel with the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality. We also have three attorneys from the attorney general's office and another attorney from the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality.

Your Honor, we were served with the notice of potential groundwater contamination at the site. Under Louisiana Revised Statute 30:2015, it provides that the state can intervene to protect the public interest, so we have the

attorney general representing us on that matter. Basically, Your Honor, today I came here on behalf of my department head. We are concerned about the area getting cleaned up, of course, and so anything that DEQ can do to help facilitate that, we are at the Court's disposal.

THE COURT: Who would we talk to? Who would be the contact? Would you handle that?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, and also the other attorney here, Donald Trahan, he will also be a point of contact.

THE COURT: We should have your telephone numbers and your addresses so we can deal with it.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you gotten the material that you need so far? Have you gotten any discovery or any pleadings or anything of that sort?

MR. ROBINSON: We are just getting involved, Your Honor. As a matter of fact, I just remarked to someone this morning it's kind of like dropping into a parachute zone, and we are still trying to get our bearings and everything. We are just getting involved, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, get to the liaison counsel. I have a website in this case. You can click on the website and see information. I put everything on the website. If you need any additional material, the names and addresses of liaison counsel are on the website. You can contact them and get the material

1 that you need. You don't need to plow fields that have already 2 been plowed. 3 MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 **THE COURT:** If you need any information, those are 5 the two people you would contact, plaintiff liaison counsel and 6 defense liaison counsel. 7 MR. ROBINSON: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Anyone else? Thank you. Anything 9 further that we haven't covered? Anything new? Anything that 10 anybody from the audience has that we haven't touched on? The 11 next meeting in this matter will be May 16. I'll meet with 12 liaison counsel at 8:30 and the regular meeting will begin at 13 9:00. Thank you very much. I appreciate your work. 14 THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. (WHEREUPON, the Court was in recess.) 15 * * * 16 17 **CERTIFICATE** 18 I, Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR, Official Court Reporter, 19 United States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, do 20 hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct 21 transcript, to the best of my ability and understanding, from 22 the record of the proceedings in the above-entitled and 23 numbered matter. 24 25 Toni Doyle Tusa, CCR Official Court Reporter