## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA SOUTHERN DIVISION

\_\_\_\_\_\_

IN RE:

Case No. 7:23-CV-897

CAMP LEJEUNE WATER LITIGATION

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2024
STATUS CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT B. JONES, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:

- A. Charles Ellis, Jenna Butler, Matthew Mariani
- J. Edward Bell III, Robin Greenwald, James A. Roberts III, Hugh Overholt, Mona Lisa Wallace, William Michael Dowling, Elizabeth Cabraser (via telephone)

On Behalf of the Defendant:

David Ortiz

John Adam Bain, Sara Mirsky, Bridget Bailey Lipscomb, Elizabeth Platt, Lacresha Johnson (via telephone)

On Behalf of Settlement Master Team:
Kara Edwards, Ken Knight, Michelle Li (via telephone)

AMY M. CONDON, CRR, RPR, CSR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Raleigh, North Carolina
Stenotype with computer-aided transcription

(Wednesday, November 6th, 2024, commencing at 11:00 a.m.) 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. 4 All COUNSEL: Good morning. 5 THE COURT: Okay. I had a couple items I just 6 wanted to tick through, and then I'm happy to hear from the 7 Plaintiffs' Leadership Group and then the Government about any 8 items they would like to discuss. In no particular order -- and all of this comes out 9 10 of the status report that's been submitted. In no particular 11 order, I'll start with the exchange of the Rule 26 reliance 12 documents. I understand there's maybe a workout on a joint 13 proposal on that. 14 I quess we'll start with Mr. Bell. 15 MR. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. This is Ed Bell. 16 We have had several meet-and-confers, and I think 17 we're very close. We've talked last -- yesterday, and we'll 18 be sending to the Government our final proposal which I think 19 will probably be acceptable. 20 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bain, anything to add to that? 21 22 MR. BAIN: No. I agree with that, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And then a joint proposal 24 regarding consolidating the blood cancer Track 1 diseases; is

25

that coming our way?

```
1
             MR. BELL:
                       Well, I know we talked about it.
   need for us to send a proposed order, Your Honor, we'll be
 3
   happy to do so.
 4
             THE COURT:
                          I didn't know if you were -- I know we
 5
   talked about it. I didn't know if you needed to beyond us
   having spoken about it.
 7
             MR. BELL: It's fine with us, Your Honor, leaving it
   like it is. If you would like to have a joint proposal, we'll
8
 9
   be glad to submit one.
10
             THE COURT: Okay. I just don't know what I don't
11
   know, you know what I mean?
12
             MR. BELL:
                        Okay.
13
             THE COURT: I mean, I understand the issue.
                                                           I don't
14
   know if we need anything further. So I'll leave that -- I'll
15
   leave that up to y'all.
             MR. BELL: All right. I'll get with Mr. Bain and
16
17
   we'll talk about it and get back with you.
18
             THE COURT: And then what's remaining on the -- I
19
   guess it's the fact discovery update regarding 30(b)(6)
20
   depositions of ATSDR. What's going on there?
21
             MR. BELL: Your Honor, we have met and conferred and
22
   now we have resolved the issues in regards to the 30(b)(6) and
23
   have withdrawn the last parts that have not -- that were going
2.4
   to be covered by Mr. -- Dr. Bove. So that's been resolved.
```

THE COURT: But you've got some other depositions

25

```
coming down, Martel and Williams, on 11, 12, and 15
1
 2
   respectively, right?
 3
              MR. BELL: Those are going forward as far as I know,
 4
   Your Honor, and I think all the issues involved and those
 5
   depositions have been resolved and I think they're going
 6
   forward.
 7
              THE COURT: Were there some objections to documents
   regarding Mr. Williams' deposition?
8
 9
              MR. BELL:
                         There were, and I think those were with
10
   the -- not with the Government, but those have been resolved
11
   as of last night.
12
              THE COURT: Is that right, Mr. Bain?
13
              MR. BAIN: That is correct, Your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: Okay. Was that the clawback issue, the
15
   seven documents, the clawback issue.
16
              MR. BELL: There was some documents in the lift to
17
   protect the documents that the parties found from a third
18
   party that were part of the proposed or the protected
   documents.
19
                Those have been discussed and exchanged and now
20
   there's a resolution to that.
21
              THE COURT: All right.
22
              MR. BAIN:
                         Yes.
23
              THE COURT: Go ahead.
2.4
              MR. BAIN: That was I believe in reference to the
25
   National Academy of Science documents and those -- that has
```

1 been resolved with respect to Susan Martel's deposition.

The -- regarding the UST documents, Mr. Ortiz is there, and that issue has also been resolved; but if you would like some background on the resolution of that issue, Mr. Ortiz can provide that.

THE COURT: Nothing more than hearing from you that it's been resolved.

MR. ORTIZ: Yes, Your Honor. David Ortiz from the United States. It has been fully resolved, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right.

How about supplemental damage assessment forms for the Track 1 trial plaintiffs, what's the status there?

MR. BELL: They are being produced as we obtain new information, Your Honor. I'm not involved in that day-to-day, but I think everything is going well.

THE COURT: Mr. Bain, anything to add?

MR. BAIN: Yes. This is Adam Bain. I think conferences with the plaintiffs' counsel about this and we've agreed to address it on a case-by-case basis.

I believe they've agreed that we would be entitled to some additional discovery dependent on the new claim being asserted, and we'll try to resolve that. We don't want to unreasonably burden the plaintiffs, but we do want to preserve our right to get additional information that we might need in advance of any trial.

I think it has come up with one plaintiff so far, and I think the Plaintiffs' Leadership Group has agreed to allow a deposition of the treating disease with respect to a new disease and that we will confer with them further on whether and how long we need to take an additional deposition of the plaintiff.

2.4

But to the extent these issues continue to come up,

I think the parties can meet and confer and hopefully work out
resolution.

THE COURT: Okay. Okay. So the parties have submitted at Docket Entry 298/1 an amended stipulated order regarding expert examinations of the plaintiffs.

Is the purpose of this to provide notice to defendant's of IMEs about testifying about plaintiffs' testifying experts? Is that what this is for?

MR. BELL: Your Honor, I think the concern we had was in defining the term "examination." And when we were talking to our experts, some of which would like to have a conversation with the plaintiffs, if they get a history or something like that, we thought that might be considered, quote, "an examination." So we notified the Government of our concern, and I think we've reached an understanding of how to handle this since.

THE COURT: All right. What does -- maybe I'm overanalyzing this or reading too much into it, but in the

proposal -- I guess I'm just curious in paragraph 4 what
reasonably certain" means. What do you think "reasonably
certain" means?

MR. BELL: Your Honor, we, of course -- yes, sir. This is Ed Bell again.

Both sides, I'm fairly certain, have consulting experts and they're doing some background work for us, and if they, of course, interview the plaintiffs, that would not be someone who's reasonably certain that's going to testify. However, if we have experts that we anticipate calling as witnesses, then that would give us an obligation to notify the Government earlier.

THE COURT: But that may change, one may start out, right, as a consulting expert and then you may decide that this person --

MR. BELL: That's correct.

THE COURT: So what would -- I'm just trying to get an understanding of what "reasonably certain" means.

MR. BELL: Well, if the consulting expert is -turned into or changes status into a testifying expert, the
original concern was this was -- if it happened late in the
game, then it would put the Government at a disadvantage of
not knowing basically what this particular expert might say.
So recognizing that potential problem, we've -- I think we've
made a pretty good effort at getting it resolved.

```
1
              THE COURT: Mr. Bain, what do you think?
 2
              MR. BAIN:
                        I'm going to ask Ms. Platt to address
 3
   this.
 4
              MS. PLATT: Your Honor, Elizabeth Platt here from
 5
   the United States.
 6
              That portion of CMO-11 came from the previous
 7
   version, and we agree with what Mr. Bell just said that when
   he and his team are reasonably certain that a consulting
   expert has changed to a testifying expert that he will give us
 9
   notice, and I'm sure Mr. Bell will give us enough notice that
10
   we could then request an exam, as our reciprocal right is, and
11
12
   he would give us the opportunity to do so.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Platt, do you have a copy of
14
   the order there in front of you by chance?
                          I'm sorry, Your Honor. I don't have a
15
              MS. PLATT:
16
   copy in front of me.
17
              THE COURT: I'll read this to you and see if you can
18
   explain it to me.
19
              In paragraph 5, and I'm reading from paragraph 5.
20
   It says, "In the event that the PLG provides notice of a
   mental or physical examination of a plaintiff by an expert..."
21
22
   and then it goes on further.
23
              But what that -- when it says "by an expert," what
24
   you're really talking about is by a testifying expert,
```

25

correct?

MS. PLATT: Yes, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 3 Other than our future -- our meeting later on this 4 month, perhaps, of scheduling that, I didn't have anything 5 else to talk about. 6 I'm happy to talk to y'all about things you want to 7 bring up, so... 8 Your Honor -- go ahead. I'm sorry, Adam. MR. BELL: 9 MR. BAIN: I was just going to give Your Honor an 10 update on discussion we had last conference regarding the 11 evidence presented -- to be presented at different phases. And I know Your Honor issued an order last week on that 12 13 regarding, you know, whether any brief would be necessary. 14 THE COURT: Uhm-uhm. 15 MR. BAIN: The plaintiffs made their initial 16 disclosures, expert reports on the water contamination phase, 17 and there weren't any (inaudible) regarding vapor intrusions 18 so I don't think --19 I'm sorry. There weren't any many what THE COURT: 20 regarding vapor intrusions? 21 MR. BAIN: Opinions regarding vapor intrusions. So 22 we don't think that's an issue that needs to be addressed 23 right now in Phase I. It may be an issue that we need to 2.4 address in the future.

On Phase II, we had a discussion with the

25

```
Plaintiffs' Leadership Group yesterday, and I think we're

close to reaching an agreement on the nature of proof to be

presented in Phase II.

So at this time, I don't anticipate that the United

States from what we've discussed with Plaintiffs' Leadership
```

Group that the plaintiffs will need to submit any type of brief pursuant to the Court's order; but if the Court would like a notice as to what our agreement is, we can certainly submit that.

10 THE COURT: Your agreement as to what?

MR. BAIN: The nature of proof to be presented in Phase II.

THE COURT: I'll leave it to y'all what you think you need to submit to the Court.

MR. BAIN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's why I wanted to enter that order.

Mr. Bell.

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. BELL: Your Honor, I have one -- well, other than scheduling, I have one other issue that has arisen.

We gave notice yesterday to Adam and his crew about a problem that has arisen with one of our clients, one of the bellwether clients. For the purpose -- since this is a public record, I'll leave his name off at this time, Your Honor. But he's a Track 1 bladder cancer client.

Very recently this gentleman who's diagnosed with

```
multiple metastasis of his cancer, he's in very bad shape,
1
   we're having trouble working with him. We sent a letter
 3
   outlining the request of -- outlining his particular medical
 4
   issues and have asked the Government to consider allowing him
 5
   to withdraw from the bellwether plaintiffs.
 6
              I'll be glad to forward this to you, Your Honor,
7
   after the hearing if you'd like to see it. We're waiting on
8
   the Government to give us their response.
 9
              THE COURT: Mr. Bain; is that right?
10
              MR. BAIN:
                         That is correct. We did have a
11
   discussion yesterday about it. The plaintiffs have provided,
12
   as Mr. Bell just mentioned, a written request and we are
13
   considering that, and I anticipate we'll have a response to
14
   the plaintiffs this week.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Well, I'll just wait until
16
   you have it -- have it resolved, and in some way advise the
17
   Court as to where that case stands.
18
              Okay. Anything else?
                        That's all the plaintiffs have, Your
19
              MR. BELL:
20
   Honor, at this time.
21
              MR. BAIN: Nothing else from the United States, Your
22
   Honor.
23
              THE COURT:
                          All right. Ms. Butler? Mr. Ellis?
2.4
              MR. ELLIS:
                          No, Your Honor.
25
              THE COURT: Mr. Ortiz?
```

MR. ORTIZ: Nothing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Our next conference, I'm looking at the week of the 18th. And specifically, Wednesday through Friday, the 20th through the 22nd.

Mr. Bell, what are your thoughts about those days? Otherwise, the following week we get into the holidays.

MR. BELL: Well, Judge, I certainly enjoy having these meetings, I think it's good. But I think for us, I'm not sure we need one that quickly. Maybe we could have one the week after Thanksgiving, or if you want to do it that week, I'm free on the 20th or the 21st, Your Honor. Or maybe do another virtual, which I think works well for these short status conferences.

THE COURT: Perhaps do a virtual one the 20th or the 15 21st?

MR. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. Friday begins the holiday and our children get out of school and we're going to try and sneak away if we can, so the 20th or 21st would be best for us.

THE COURT: Mr. Bain, what do you think?

MR. BAIN: Your Honor, those days are good for us, either in Wilmington or virtual. So whatever the Court wants to do.

THE COURT: Let's set it on the 20th at 11:00 o'clock, and we can do the way we're doing it this morning

```
which I think is perfectly fine. We have folks here in person
 1
   and on the television.
 2
              All right. We'll set it for then. All right.
 3
   Thank you very much.
 4
 5
               (The proceedings concluded at 11:24 a.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	UNITED STATE DISTRICT COURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
3	
4	CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER
5	
6	I, Amy M. Condon, CRR, RPR, CSR, Federal Official
7	Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court
8	for the Eastern District of North Carolina, do hereby certify
9	that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code,
10	that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the
11	stenographically reported proceedings held in the
12	above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is
13	in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference
14	of the United States.
15	
16	
17	Dated this 7th day of November, 2024.
18	
19	Amy M. Condon
20	/s/ Amy M. Condon Amy M. Condon, CRR, CSR, RPR
21	U.S. Official Court Reporter
22	
23	
24	
25	