IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	**Case No. 4:05-cv-00329-TCK-SAJ**
	)	
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES OF STATE OF OKLAHOMA TO SEPARATE DEFENDANT CARGILL INC.'S AMENDED FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED TO PLAINTIFFS

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. The State objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they seek the discovery of information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or the work product doctrine.

2. The State objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they seek the discovery of information that is already in the possession of defendant, is obtainable from another source that is more convenient, less burdensome or less expensive, or is as accessible to defendant as it is to the State. As such, the burden of obtaining such sought-after information is substantially the same, or less, for defendant as it is for the State.

3. The State objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they are overly broad, oppressive, unduly burdensome and expensive to answer. Providing answers to such discovery requests would needlessly and improperly burden the State.

4. The State objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they improperly seek identification of "all" items or "each" item of responsive information or to state "with particularity" the basis for each and every contention of the State. Such discovery requests are

Exhibit 18-5

thus overly broad and unduly burdensome. It may be impossible to locate "all" items or "each" item of responsive information to such discovery requests, or at this stage of the case to state "with particularity" each and every basis for each contention. It is improper by interrogatory to require the State to provide a narrative account of its case.

5. The State objects to the submission of contention interrogatories because such interrogatories are premature. Discovery is ongoing. The State requested documents from the Cargill entities on July 10, 2006, and received them only on December 5, 2006. The State has not yet had the time to review and analyze the documents produced. The State is engaged in determining the particular roles, acts and omissions of the Cargill defendants pertinent to the allegations of the First Amended Complaint. The State objects to supplying more than the principal and material facts supporting its allegations at this point. Pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 33(c) full responses to all contention interrogatories should be deferred until discovery is completed.

6. The State objects to the extent that discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative.

7. The State objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they do not state with the required degree of specificity and particularity what information is being sought. As such, such discovery requests are vague, indefinite, ambiguous and not susceptible to easily discernible meaning.

8. The state objects to these discovery requests to the extent that the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, taking into account the needs of the case, the amount in controversy, the parties resources, and the importance of the proposed discovery in resolving the issues.

9. The State objects to these discovery requests to the extent that they improperly attempt to

impose obligations on the State other than those imposed or authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

10. The State objects to the definitions of these discovery requests to the extent that they improperly attempt to alter the plain meaning of certain words, and expressly the State objects to the definition of "You" as including any municipality, employee, attorney, agent or other representative of the State.

11. By submitting these responses, the State does not acknowledge that the requested information is necessarily relevant or admissible. The State expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery into the subject matter of any information provided and to the introduction of such information into evidence. The State also reserves its right to supplement these responses as appropriate or as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Without waiving the foregoing objections, but hereby incorporating each of them by reference in the specific responses as if fully set forth therein, and subject thereto, the State further states and alleges as follows:

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 43 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity "so dominates and controls the actions and activities of its respective poultry growers that the relationship is not one of independent contractor, but rather one of employer and employee or one of principal and agent, and one of owner, operator or arranger of poultry waste under CERCLA" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts

which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 (organizational papers for Cargill Turkey LLC were filed with Arkansas Secretary of State on 5/20/04) and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, integrated poultry production companies, like the Cargill entities, either raise birds themselves, or under contract arrangements with growers. In those instances in which the integrator contracts with growers, the integrator controls, via its contractual relationship and through representatives who make numerous periodic site visits to its respective poultry growers' operations to ensure compliance with its dictates regarding the care and handling of its birds. Growers have no opportunity to negotiate the essential terms of their contracts, which are contracts of adhesion.

The integrator supplies young birds to its respective growers and picks up the birds from its respective poultry growers when the birds reach the desired level of maturity. The integrator

maintains ownership of the birds throughout the process. The integrator formulates and provides feed to the contract growers. By its contracts, and grower manuals or other directives, the integrator dictates to the grower the type of buildings, equipment and other facilities to be used in the grower's operation, the feed to be fed to the birds in the grower's care, any feed supplements to be fed to the birds, the medications and vaccinations to be provided to the birds and the environmental conditions under which the birds are raised.

Cargill Inc. was a named defendant in *City of Tulsa v. Tyson et.al*, Case No. 4:01-cv-00900 CVE-PJC. The *City of Tulsa Defendants* acknowledged that they deliver baby birds to their contract growers, provide feed and medication for the birds, provide suggestions to improve each contract grower's performance, and pick up the birds prior to processing. *City of Tulsa v. Tyson* summary judgment response brief at ¶ 1, p. 3. Dkt. No. 255, attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Cargill specifically admitted that it met with its contract growers on a regular basis to provide education, guidance, and best management practices on waste management and disposal practices. *City of Tulsa v. Tyson* summary judgment response brief at ¶ 26, p. 15.

The integrator is intimately involved in and controls each stage of the poultry growing process. The level of control by the integrator is such that Cargill so dominates and controls the actions and activities of its respective poultry growers that the relationship is not one of independent contractor, but rather one of employer and employee or one of principal and agent, and one of owner, operator or arranger of poultry waste under CERCLA.

Because the operations of the Cargill entities in the IRW inevitably create large amounts of waste, and the Cargill entities are legally responsible for waste created by their birds, the Cargill entities constitute owners of the waste, operators of facilities at which or from which waste was disposed, or arrangers of poultry waste by arranging for its disposal by growers or

others under CERCLA.

The State further directs the Cargill Turkey's attention to Oklahoma Attorney General Opinion, 2001 OK AG 17. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶¶ 13-14 of Your Amended Complaint that "[any Cargill entity]...is responsible for the poultry waste created by poultry growing operations, its handling and storage, and its disposal on lands within the IRW and the resultant injury to the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on

December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, please see the Response to Interrogatory No. 1 regarding the responsibility of the Cargill entities for the waste created by their birds in the IRW. Additionally, because poultry waste "necessarily follows" from the "growing" of poultry, the Cargill entities are responsible for the nuisance and trespass created by waste generated by their birds. Restatement Second of Torts, § 427B. Cargill entities are responsible for the nuisance and trespass created by Land applying poultry waste at times and places in a manner which causes large quantities of soluble and particulate phosphorus, as well as bacteria, and other pollutants to be released from application sites which can travel by surface runoff within the IRW during and after rainfall. Litter is commonly piled in the open air without proper cover or flooring by Poultry Integrator Defendants or their growers in the IRW. The Defendants, including Cargill, have sufficient ongoing presence in the IRW to observe and know of this improper storage. Further, excessive application of poultry waste causes phosphorus and other pollutants to build up in the soil to such an extent that, even without any additional application of poultry waste to the land, the excess residual phosphorus and other pollutants will continue to run off and be released into the waters of the IRW in the future. Phosphorus transported to the waters and sediments of the IRW causes excessive algal growth, algal blooms, hypolimnetic anoxia and other adverse impacts in the waters of the IRW, resulting in eutrophication, a degradation in water quality and sediments, injury to biota and impaired uses. Bacteria from poultry waste creates a risk to human health when washed into the waters of the

IRW from land application sites. Other pollutants from poultry waste may also harm biota within the IRW. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 31 of Your Amended Complaint that "[any Cargill entity], by virtue of [its] improper poultry waste disposal practices, [is] responsible for this pollution of, as well as the degradation of, impairment of and injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State

requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, please see Responses to Interrogatories No. 1 and 2. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State does not presently know which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶ 44 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity "[knew] and had any reason to know that in the ordinary course of the poultry growers raising birds in the usual and prescribed manner poultry waste will be handled and disposed of in such a manner to cause injury to the IRW, including the biota, lands, waters and sediments therein..." and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents,

which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, the Court in *City of Tulsa v. Tyson, et al.* 258 F.Supp. 2d, 1253, 1296 (N.D. Okl. 2003) found that, "[a]lthough Poultry Defendants cite other sources of phosphorus in the Watershed, they admit in their response brief that they were aware in the 1990s that "phosphorus presented potential problems to the Watershed" and, therefore, attempted to address the problem by educating their growers regarding better litter management. Given these admissions, the Court finds Poultry Defendants had "reason to recognize that, in the ordinary course of [the growers] doing the work in the usual or prescribed manner, the trespass or nuisance is likely to result." Cargill was a defendant in the *City of Tulsa* case. In the response brief in question, the *City of Tulsa* defendants, including Cargill, admitted that they became aware of the environmental impact of phosphorous in poultry waste in "approximately the mid-1990s." Dkt. No. 255, Case No. 4:01-cv-00900-CVE-PJC, attached hereto as Exhibit 1 at ¶ 4, p. 4. No material difference exists between the polluting

results of land application of poultry waste in the Eucha-Spavinaw watershed, which was the subject of the *City of Tulsa* case, and that of the IRW. Particularly as regards phosphorus and bacteria, it has long been understood in academic and industry circles that land application of wastes can lead to the environmental harms which are the subject of this suit. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 48 that any Cargill entity "has long known that it has been and continues to be the practice to routinely and repeatedly improperly store the poultry waste generated in the course of its respective growing operations on lands within the IRW" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State

understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, the State refers Cargill to its response to interrogatories Nos. 1-4.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State does not presently know which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegations in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 50 that any Cargill entity "has long known that the application of poultry waste to lands within the IRW, in the amounts that it is applied, is in excess of any agronomics need and is not consistent with good agricultural practices and, as such, constitutes waste disposal rather than any normal or appropriate application of fertilizer" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents,

which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, see Response to Interrogatory No. 4. In addition, based on ODAFF inspector soil test results of poultry operations in the summer and fall of 2002 in several counties of Oklahoma in the scenic river watersheds, and an STP threshold of 120 pounds per acre, the Secretary of the Environment has determined that 77% of sites tested exceeded an STP of 120, and 33% of samples exceeded an STP of 300. See SB 972 report, attached hereto, at p. 12-13. Soil nutrient experts at both Oklahoma State University and the University of Arkansas agree that an STP level greater than 65 to 100 is of no value to crops. SB 972 report at p. 3. Phosphorus applied to land in excess of these agronomic needs does not cause the growth of more or better plants, and thus is no longer "fertilizer" in any sense, but is, instead, waste disposal. These findings merely mirror what has long been understood in academic and industry circles about the effect of over application of poultry waste on STP and the agronomic needs of crops and forage. In further response to this interrogatory

and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 52 that any Cargill entity "has long known that these poultry waste disposal practices lead to the run-off and release of large quantities of phosphorus and other hazardous substances, pollutants and contaminants in the poultry waste onto and from the fields and into the waters of the IRW" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents

produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, see Response to Interrogatory No. 4.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State does has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation in Your Amended Complaint at ¶ 58 that any Cargill entity "has long known that poultry waste contains a number of constituents that can and do cause harm to the environment and pose human health hazards" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State

requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, see Responses to Interrogatories Number 4 and 15.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation in ¶ 56 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity's "poultry waste disposal practices are not, and have not been, undertaken in conformity with federal and state laws and regulations" and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. Paragraph 56 of the First Amended Complaint merely refers to other paragraphs of the First Amended Complaint which allege violations of state and federal laws and regulations. The State objects because this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a contention interrogatory that asks the State to essentially state the factual and legal basis for its entire lawsuit. Additionally, the legal basis for

this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Counts 1 and 2 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity violated CERCLA and identify every witness upon whom you will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State objects because this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a contention interrogatory that asks the State essentially to state the factual and legal basis for two entire counts of its lawsuit. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, the State refers Cargill to the State's responses in Interrogatories Nos. 1-3. Furthermore, the State restates and incorporates its allegations in the States First Amended Complaint Counts 1 and 2.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 3 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity violated the Solid Waste Disposal Act and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State objects because

this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a contention interrogatory that asks the State to essentially state the factual and legal basis for an entire count of its lawsuit. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, the State refers Cargill to the State's responses in Interrogatories Nos. 1-3. Furthermore, the State restates and incorporates its allegations in the States First Amended Complaint Count 3.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation contained in ¶ 95 of Your Amended Complaint that "[a]n imminent and substantial endangerment to health or the environmental may be presented and is in fact presented as a direct and proximate result of [any Cargill entity's] respective contribution to the handling, storage, treatment, transportation or disposal of poultry waste in the IRW and lands and waters therein" and identify every witness upon whom You will

rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, please see the response to Interrogatory No. 15 below, which relates to the same topic. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 4 of Your Amended Complaint that the conduct and acts of any Cargill entity constitute a nuisance under Oklahoma law (including, but not limited to, an alleged violation of 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-6-105 or 2 Okla. Stat. § 2-18.1) and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, see Response to Interrogatory No. 2 regarding pollution of the waters resulting from land application of poultry litter and the Cargill entity's responsibility for it. One of the statutes inquired about, 2 Okla. Stat. § 2-18.1,

makes it unlawful for any person to cause pollution of any waters of the state or to place or cause to be placed any wastes in a location where they are likely to cause pollution of any air, land or waters of the state. Any such action is hereby declared to be a public nuisance. Cargill has placed waste or caused waste to be placed in locations throughout the IRW where it is likely to cause pollution of the land or waters of the state and, in fact, does cause pollution of land and waters of the state. Similarly, 27A Okla. Stat. § 2-6-105 is violated when persons cause pollution of any waters of the state or to place or cause to be placed any wastes in a location where they are likely to cause pollution of any air, land or waters of the state. Any such action is hereby declared to be a public nuisance. The Poultry Integrator Defendants are directly responsible for any of their own operations within Oklahoma which pollute the land and water, and are legally responsible for the operations of their contract growers which do so. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state completely and in detail the facts upon which you base the allegation contained in Count 5 of Your Amended Complaint that the conduct and acts of any Cargill entity constitutes a nuisance under federal law and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds

that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, with regard to Count 5, the birds owned by the Poultry Integrator Defendants create large amounts of waste annually, which the Poultry Integrator Defendants do not properly store or dispose of, but instead leave waste in circumstances in which it is inevitable that the waste, and its constituents, will migrate to the lands, soil, water and sediments of the Oklahoma portion of the IRW. The constituents of that waste, including but not limited to phosphorus and bacteria, making their way to the lands, soil, water and sediments of the Oklahoma portion of the IRW cause an unreasonable invasion of, impairment to, interference with, inconvenience, annoyance, and injury to the land, soil, water and sediments of the Oklahoma portion of the IRW. At a minimum, the improper waste disposal practices of the Poultry Integrator Defendants create a situation in which a nuisance necessarily follows from the work of the industry's contract growers. The Poultry Integrator Defendants have reason to recognize that, in the ordinary course of doing the work of growing their poultry in the usual or prescribed manner, a nuisance is likely to result. The Poultry Integrator

Defendants have been aware of the substantial and unnecessary risk of nuisance to the State and that their improper waste disposal practices will cause injury to the State, and did not care that such injury would result. Consequently, they have acted recklessly and intentionally. With knowledge that a nuisance would likely result, the Poultry Integrator Defendants have acted unreasonably in the face of the fact that their conduct would cause serious harm to the State of Oklahoma. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in ¶¶ 100, 112, 113, 115 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity has caused and is causing "unreasonable and substantial danger to the public's health and safety" in the Illinois River Watershed and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry

operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

The State notes that ¶ 110 does not explicitly refer to health and safety issues, but refers to injuries more generally. To the extent that health and safety risks are encompassed within those injuries, and with regard to the other paragraphs enquired about, and subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, the Poultry Integrator Defendants' improper waste disposal practices allow large amounts of bacteria from poultry waste to enter waters of the State. Phosphorus transported from the land application sites causes algae to grow in the waters of the IRW. It has long been understood in academic and industry circles that poultry waste contains bacteria and that nutrients in water increases levels of algae which causes the formation of disinfection byproducts in drinking water. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with

particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 6 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity has committed trespass under applicable state law and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, with regard to Count 6, the birds owned by the Poultry Integrator Defendants create large amounts of waste annually, which the Poultry Integrator Defendants do not properly store or dispose of, but instead leave that waste in circumstances in which it is inevitable that waste, and its constituents, will migrate to the lands, soil, water and sediments of the Oklahoma portion of the IRW. The constituents of that

waste, including but not limited to phosphorus and bacteria, making their way to the lands, soil, water and sediments of the Oklahoma portion of the IRW cause an unauthorized, actual and physical invasion of, and interference with, the land, soil, water and sediments of the Oklahoma portion of the IRW to which the State holds an interest in, or over which the State acts as trustee. At a minimum, the improper waste disposal practices of the Poultry Integrator Defendants create a situation in which a trespass necessarily follows. The Poultry Integrator Defendants have reason to recognize that, in the ordinary course of doing the work of growing their poultry in the usual or prescribed manner, a trespass is likely to result. The Poultry Integrator Defendants have been aware of the substantial and unnecessary risk of trespass to the State and that their improper waste disposal practices will cause injury to the State, and did not care that such injury would result. Consequently, they have acted recklessly and intentionally. With knowledge that a trespass would likely result, the Poultry Integrator Defendants have acted unreasonably in the face of the fact that their conduct would cause serious harm to the State of Oklahoma. In further response to this interrogatory and pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(d), information sought in this Interrogatory, and whose production is not objected herein, may be found within the business records being provided to Defendants in onsite agency productions. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: Separately for each Cargill entity at issue, state with particularity the factual and legal basis for the allegation contained in Count 8 of Your Amended Complaint that any Cargill entity violated 2 Okla. Stat. § 10-9.7 and Oklahoma Administrative Code § 35:17-5-5 and identify every witness upon whom You will rely to establish each fact.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17: The State incorporates its general objections set forth herein, and the State further objects to the extent that this interrogatory seeks facts which are protected by attorney client privilege, work product protection, or which have been prepared in anticipation of litigation or trial by the State's counsel, expert consultants, or agents, which have not yet been identified as testifying experts in this matter. The State further responds that this interrogatory is unduly burdensome and is a premature contention interrogatory.

As regards the request for information regarding "each Cargill entity at issue," the State understands that Cargill created Cargill Turkey in 2004 and transferred some or all of its poultry operations in the IRW to it thereafter. The State is investigating the relationship between Cargill and Cargill Turkey, and the particular activities of each of the Cargill entities. The State requested documents relevant to this relationship on July 10, 2006 and only received them on December 5, 2006, and has not had an opportunity to review and analyze the documents produced. Therefore, it cannot at present state its response "with particularity" as to each Cargill entity.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, as a general matter, subject to ongoing discovery of the particulars relevant to the Cargill entities, see Responses to Interrogatories Numbered 1 and 2 for the basis of the responsibility of the Poultry Integrator Defendants for poultry waste generated by their birds. The improper waste disposal practices of the Poultry Integrator Defendants, described in the First Amended Complaint and in the responses to Cargill and Cargill Turkey interrogatories, violate 2 Okla.Stat. § 10-9.7 by allowing the discharge or runoff of poultry waste to the waters of the state, by storing waste not isolated from outside surface draining by ditches, dikes, berms, terraces or other such structures, by creating an environmental or public health hazard, by operating in a way resulting in the

contamination of the waters of the state, by failing to provide controls for runoff and erosion as appropriate for site conditions, by failing to prohibit discharge or runoff of poultry waste from the application site, and by land applying at times and places in a manner which has caused the runoff of poultry waste. The improper waste storage and disposal practices of the Poultry Integrator Defendants, described in the First Amended Complaint and in the responses to Cargill and Cargill Turkey interrogatories, violate Oklahoma Administrative Code § 35:17-5-5 by failing to ensure that poultry waste is not stored without adequate protection from rainfall and runoff, land applying at appropriate times and rates, and by failing to prohibit the discharge and runoff of poultry waste from the application site. Additionally, the legal basis for this allegation appears in the First Amended Complaint.

Because discovery is ongoing, the State has not determined which witnesses it will use to support its claims referenced in this interrogatory.

Respectfully Submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA # 2628
Attorney General
Kelly H. Burch OBA #17067
J. Trevor Hammons OBA #20234
Robert D. Singletary OBA #19220
Assistant Attorneys General
State of Oklahoma
2300 North Lincoln Boulevard, Suite 112
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
(405) 521-3921

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Douglas A. Wilson OBA #13128
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
Riggs, Abney, Neal, Turpen,
Orbison & Lewis
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

James Randall Miller, OBA #6214
David P. Page, OBA #6852
Louis Werner Bullock, OBA #1305
Miller Keffer & Bullock
222 S. Kenosha
Tulsa, Ok 74120-2421
(918) 743-4460

Frederick C. Baker
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth C. Ward
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
Lee M. Heath
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth Claire Xidis
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
Motley Rice, LLC
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mount Pleasant, SC 29465
(843) 216-9280

William H. Narwold
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
Motley Rice, LLC
20 Church Street, 17th Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
(860) 882-1676

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

VERIFICATION

STATE OF OKLAHOMA)
) ss:
COUNTY OF OKLAHOMA)

I, Miles Tolbert, being of legal age, hereby depose and state that I have read that foregoing responses to interrogatories and that they are true and correct, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and that I furnish such responses based on consultation with representatives of the State of Oklahoma based on documents identified as of the date of this response.

Miles Tolbert
Secretary of the Environment
State of Oklahoma

Signed and subscribed to before me on this 11th day of December, 2006.

Notary Public

JOYCE K. BOYD
NOTARY
02017963
EXP. 11/09/10
PUBLIC
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 11th day of December, 2006, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the following:

- **Jo Nan Allen** - jonanallen@yahoo.com bacaviola@yahoo.com
- **Robert Earl Applegate** - hm@holdenokla.com rapplegate@holdenokla.com
- **Frederick C Baker** - fbaker@motleyrice.com, mcarr@motleyrice.com, fhmorgan@motleyrice.com
- **Tim Keith Baker** - tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net
- **Sherry P Bartley** - sbartley@mwsgw.com jdavis@mwsgw.com
- **Michael R. Bond** - Michael.Bond@kutakrock.com
- **Douglas L Boyd** - dboyd31244@aol.com
- **Vicki Bronson** - vbronson@cwlaw.com lphillips@cwlaw.com
- **Paula M Buchwald** - pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com
- **Louis Werner Bullock** - lbullock@mkblaw.net, nhodge@mkblaw.net, bdejong@mkblaw.net
- **Michael Lee Carr** - hm@holdenokla.com mcarr@holdenokla.com
- **Bobby Jay Coffman** - bcoffman@loganlowry.com
- **Lloyd E Cole, Jr** - colelaw@alltel.net, gloriaeubanks@alltel.net; amy_colelaw@alltel.net
- **Angela Diane Cotner** - AngelaCotnerEsq@yahoo.com
- **Reuben Davis** - rdavis@boonesmith.com
- **John Brian DesBarres** - mrjbdb@msn.com JohnD@wcalaw.com
- **W A Drew Edmondson** - fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us drew_edmondson@oag.state.ok.us;suzy_thrash@oag.state.ok.us.
- **Delmar R Ehrich** - dehrich@faegre.com, etriplett@faegre.com, qsperrazza@faegre.com
- **John R Elrod** - jelrod@cwlaw.com vmorgan@cwlaw.com
- **William Bernard Federman** - wfederman@aol.com, law@federmanlaw.com, ngb@federmanlaw.com
- **Bruce Wayne Freeman** - bfreeman@cwlaw.com lclark@cwlaw.com
- **Ronnie Jack Freeman** - jfreeman@grahamfreeman.com
- **Richard T Garren** - rgarren@riggsabney.com dellis@riggsabney.com
- **Dorothy Sharon Gentry** - sgentry@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com
- **Robert W George** - robert.george@kutakrock.com sue.arens@kutakrock.com
- **Tony Michael Graham** - tgraham@grahamfreeman.com
- **James Martin Graves** - jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com
- **Michael D Graves** - mgraves@hallestill.com, jspring@hallestill.com, smurphy@hallestill.com
- **Jennifer Stockton Griffin** - jgriffin@lathropgage.com
- **Carrie Griffith** - griffithlawoffice@yahoo.com
- **John Trevor Hammons** - thammons@oag.state.ok.us Trevor_Hammons@oag.state.ok.us, Jean_Burnett@oag.state.ok.us
- **Michael Todd Hembree** - hembreelaw1@aol.com traesmom_mdl@yahoo.com
- **Theresa Noble Hill** - thillcourts@rhodesokla.com mnave@rhodesokla.com

- **Philip D Hixon** - Phixon@jpm-law.com
- **Mark D Hopson** - mhopson@sidley.com joraker@sidley.com
- **Kelly S Hunter Burch** - fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us;jean_burnett@oag.state.ok.us
- **Thomas Janer** - SCMJ@sbcglobal.net, tjaner@cableone.net, lanaphillips@sbcglobal.net
- **Stephen L Jantzen** - sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com mantene@ryanwhaley.com;loelke@ryanwhaley.com
- **Mackenzie Lea Hamilton Jessie** - maci.tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net tbakerlaw@sbcglobal.net;macijessie@yahoo.com
- **Bruce Jones** - bjones@faegre.com dybarra@faegre.com;jintermill@faegre.com;cdolan@faegre.com
- **Jay Thomas Jorgensen** - jjorgensen@sidley.com
- **Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee** - kklee@faegre.com mlokken@faegre.com
- **Derek Stewart Allan Lawrence** – hm@holdenokla.com dlawrence@holdenokla.com
- **Raymond Thomas Lay** - rtl@kiralaw.com dianna@kiralaw.com;niccilay@cox.net
- **Nicole Marie Longwell** - Nlongwell@jpm-law.com lwaddel@jpm-law.com
- **Dara D Mann** - dmann@faegre.com kolmscheid@faegre.com
- **Teresa Brown Marks** - teresa.marks@arkansasag.gov dennis.hansen@arkansasag.gov
- **Linda C Martin** - lmartin@dsda.com mschooling@dsda.com
- **Archer Scott McDaniel** - Smcdaniel@jpm-law.com jwaller@jpm-law.com
- **Robert Park Medearis, Jr** - medearislawfirm@sbcglobal.net
- **James Randall Miller** - rmiller@mkblaw.net smilata@mkblaw.net;clagrone@mkblaw.net
- **Charles Livingston Moulton** - Charles.Moulton@arkansasag.gov Kendra.Jones@arkansasag.gov
- **Robert Allen Nance** - rnance@riggsabney.com jzielinski@riggsabney.com
- **William H Narwold** - bnarwold@motleyrice.com
- **John Stephen Neas** - steve_neas@yahoo.com
- **George W Owens** - gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com
- **David Phillip Page** - dpage@mkblaw.net smilata@mkblaw.net
- **Michael Andrew Pollard** - mpollard@boonesmith.com kmiller@boonesmith.com
- **Marcus N Ratcliff** - mratcliff@lswsl.com sshanks@lswsl.com
- **Robert Paul Redemann** - rredemann@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net
- **Melvin David Riggs** - driggs@riggsabney.com pmurta@riggsabney.com
- **Randall Eugene Rose** - rer@owenslawfirmpc.com ka@owenslawfirmpc.com
- **Patrick Michael Ryan** - pryan@ryanwhaley.com jmickle@ryanwhaley.com;amcpherson@ryanwhaley.com
- **Laura E Samuelson** - lsamuelson@lswsl.com lsamuelson@gmail.com
- **Robert E Sanders** - rsanders@youngwilliams.com
- **David Charles Senger** - dsenger@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net;shardin@pmrlaw.net
- **Jennifer Faith Sherrill** - jfs@federmanlaw.com law@federmanlaw.com;ngb@federmanlaw.com
- **Robert David Singletary** - fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us robert_singletary@oag.state.ok.us;jean_burnett@oag.state.ok.us
- **Michelle B Skeens** - hm@holdenokla.com mskeens@holdenokla.com
- **William Francis Smith** - bsmith@grahamfreeman.com

- **Monte W. Strout** – strout@xtremeinet.net
- **Colin Hampton Tucker** – chtucker@rhodesokla.com, scottom@rhodesokla.com
- **John H. Tucker** – jtuckercourts@rhodesokla.com, mbryce@rhodesokla.com
- **Kenneth Edward Wagner** – kwagner@lswsl.com, sshanks@lswsl.com
- **David Alden Walls** – wallsd@wwhwlaw.com, burnettt@wwhwlaw.com
- **Elizabeth C. Ward** – lward@motleyrice.com
- **Sharon K. Weaver** – sweaver@riggsabney.com, lpearson@riggsabney.com
- **Timothy K. Webster** – twebster@sidley.com, jwedeking@sidley.com, ahorner@sidley.com
- **Terry Wayen West** – terry@thewestlawfirm.com
- **Dale Kenyon Williams, Jr.** – kwilliams@hallestill.com, jspring@hallestill.com, smurphy@hallestill.com
- **Edwin Stephen Williams** – steve.williams@youngwilliams.com
- **Douglas Allen Wilson** – Doug_Wilson@riggsabney.com, jsummerlin@riggsabney.com
- **J Ron Wright** - ron@wsfw-ok.com susan@wsfw-ok.com
- **Lawrence W Zeringue** - lzeringue@pmrlaw.net scouch@pmrlaw.net

I hereby certify that on this 11th day of December, 2006, I served the foregoing document by U.S. Postal Service on the following:

Jim Bagby
RR 2, Box 1711
Westville, OK 74965

Gordon W. and Susann Clinton
23605 S Goodnight Ln
Welling, OK 74471

Eugene Dill
P.O. Box 46
Cookson, OK 74424

Marjorie Garman
5116 Highway 10
Tahlequah, OK 74464

Thomas C Green
Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP
1501 K ST NW
Washington, DC 20005

Lee M. Heath
Motley Rice LLC (Mount Pleasant)
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

G Craig Heffington
20144 W Sixshooter Rd
Cookson, OK 74427

Cherrie House and William House
P.O. Box 1097
Stilwell, OK 74960

John E. and Virginia W. Adair Family Trust
Rt 2 Box 1160
Stilwell, OK 74960

Dorothy Gene Lamb and James Lamb
Route 1, Box 253
Gore, OK 74435

Jerry M Maddux
Selby Connor Maddux Janer
P.O. Box Z
Bartlesville, OK 74005_5025

Doris Mares
P.O. Box 46
Cookson, OK 74424

Donna S Parker and Richard E. Parker
34996 S. 502 Rd
Park Hill, OK 74451

C Miles Tolbert
Secretary of the Environment
State of Oklahoma
3800 North Classen
Oklahoma City, OK 73118

Robin L. Wofford
Rt 2, Box 370
Watts, OK 74964

Elizabeth Claire Xidis
Motley, Rice, LLC (Mount Pleasant)
28 Bridgeside Blvd.
Mount Pleasant, SC 29464

D. Sharon Gentry

FILED
NOV 27 2002
Phil Lombardi, Clerk
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

THE CITY OF TULSA, and THE TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY,
Plaintiffs

Vs.

01-CV-900-EA(C)

TYSON FOODS, INC., COBB-VANTRESS, INC., PETERSON FARMS, INC.,
SIMMONS FOODS, INC., CARGILL, INC., GEORGE'S, INC., and
CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS,
Defendants

POULTRY DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION AND BRIEF FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST POULTRY DEFENDANTS ON ISSUE OF LIABILITY FOR GROWERS' DISPOSAL OF POULTRY MANURE OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION AND BRIEF TO STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION AND BRIEF FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST POULTRY DEFENDANTS

Gary V. Weeks
Vince Chadick (OB #15981)
James M. Graves (OB #16604)
BASSETT LAW FIRM
P.O. Box 3618
Fayetteville, AR 72702-3618
(479) 521-9996

AND

Richard L. Carpenter, Jr. (OB #1504)
CARPENTER, MASON & McGOWAN
1516 S. Boston Avenue, Suite 205
Tulsa, OK 74119-4013
(918) 584-7400

Attorneys for George's, Inc. and also signing by consent of other Defendants

November 27, 2002

EXHIBIT
1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

GENERAL FACTUAL BACKGROUND 1

INTRODUCTION 2

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS 3

DISCUSSION 17

PROPOSITION I

THE POULTRY DEFENDANTS ARE NOT LIABLE FOR THE ACTS OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACT GROWERS IN THE WATERSHED BASED ON THEIR NORMAL AND EXPECTED CONTRACT OPERATIONS. 17

PROPOSITION II

LAND APPLICATION OF LITTER DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A NUISANCE *PER SE*. 23

PROPOSITION III

PLAINTIFFS HAVE FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE POULTRY DEFENDANTS ARE LIABLE AS A MATTER OF LAW FOR VIOLATING STATUTES REGARDING THE POLLUTION OF A MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY. 25

POULTRY DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE 26

CONCLUSION 28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Amoco Pipeline Co. v. Herman Drainage Sys., Inc.,
212 F.Supp.2d 710 (W.D. Mich. 2002) 19

Bleeda v. Hickman-Williams,
205 N.W.2d 85 (Mich. Ct. App. 1973) 18

Carr v. Alta Verde Indus. Inc.,
931 F.2d 1055 (5th Cir. 1991) 23

Concerned Area Residents for the Env't v. Southview Farm,
834 F.Supp. 1410 (W.D.N.Y. 1993) 23

Higbee v. Starr,
598 F.Supp. 323 (E.D. Ark. 1984) 23

McQuilken v. A&R Dev. Corp.,
576 F.Supp. 1023 (E.D. Penn. 1983) 18-19

Peairs v. Fla. Publ'g Co.,
132 So.2d 561 (Fla. Ct. App. 1961) 20

Shannon v. Mo. Valley Limestone Co.,
122 N.W.2d 278 (Iowa 1963) 20

Tankersly v. Webster,
243 P.2d 745 (Okla. 1925) 21

U.S. v. Aceto Agr. Chem. Corp.,
699 F.Supp. 1384 (S.D. Iowa) 20

Weinman v. DePalma,
232 U.S. 571 (1914) 17

Statutes

27A O.S. § 2-6-105 24

50 O.S. § 1.1 25

Rules

FED. R. CIV. P. 12 . . . . . 26, 28

Other Authorities

RESTATMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 427(B) 19

Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* 27

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

1. THE CITY OF TULSA,
2. THE TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY,

Plaintiffs

v. Case No. 01-CV0900EA(C)

1. TYSON FOODS, INC.,
2. COBB-VANTRESS, INC.,
3. PETERSON FARMS, INC.,
4. SIMMONS FOODS, INC.,
5. CARGILL, INC.,
6. GEORGE'S, INC.,
7. CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS,

Defendants

POULTRY DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION AND BRIEF FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST POULTRY DEFENDANTS ON ISSUE OF LIABILITY FOR GROWERS' DISPOSAL OF POULTRY MANURE OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION AND BRIEF TO STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION AND BRIEF FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AGAINST POULTRY DEFENDANTS

Come now the Poultry Defendants, and for their Response to Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief for Partial Summary Judgment Against Poultry Defendants on Issue of Liability for Growers' Disposal of Poultry Manure (hereinafter "Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief") and, in the alternative, for their Motion and Brief to Strike Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, state as follows, to-wit:

GENERAL FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The background and general information regarding the plaintiffs' claims against the Poultry Defendants have been briefed at length by plaintiffs and the Poultry Defendants in their various motions and briefs filed to date. As such, for the purposes of this Response, instead of taking up more of this Court's valuable time reciting

background information already briefed, the Poultry Defendants hereby incorporate by reference the factual background information contained in their Joint Motions filed previously and the background information contained in their Joint Motion for Summary Judgment and Brief in Support.

INTRODUCTION

With regard to their Motion to Strike, plaintiffs' state that when this cause of action was filed on December 10, 2001, plaintiffs' entire theory of the case regarding liability of the Poultry Defendants for the acts of their independent contract growers in the Watershed was that the Poultry Defendants exercised control over their contract growers to such an extent as to negate the contract growers' independent contractor status. (Complaint, ¶¶ 17-22) Plaintiffs continued to assert this single theory of liability for six (6) months, including in their Amended Complaint. (See generally: Amended Complaint) Plaintiffs did not change their theory of liability on this issue nor did they plead the new theories they are now advancing in the instant Motion (e.g. employer is liable for acts of independent contractor that are inherently dangerous, or that the Integrators should be liable since they knew that a trespass or nuisance was likely to result from the Contract Growers' activities). (Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 17-22)

As plaintiffs succinctly state, "[m]uch time and effort has been devoted in discovery to the issue of whether these growers are truly independent contractors, given the degree of control exercised over their operations." (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief for Partial Summary Judgment, p. 2)(emphasis added) However, now, for the very first time, plaintiffs assert a new and completely different theory of liability. For all of these

reasons, the Poultry Defendants request that the Court Strike the plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, or in the alternative deny the motion.

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

Plaintiffs submit Thirty-One (31) numbered paragraphs of "facts" which they allege are undisputed. Poultry Defendants dispute the following facts or necessarily complete the facts contained in the plaintiffs' Statement of Undisputed Facts.

1. Poultry Defendants acknowledge that they contract with growers who are independent contractors who raise poultry for the Poultry Defendants. The Poultry Defendants further acknowledge that they deliver baby birds to their contract growers, provide feed and medication for the birds, provide suggestions to improve each contract grower's performance, and pick the birds up prior to processing. Peterson disputes plaintiffs' statement that David Holcombe is a "representative" of Peterson. More correctly stated Mr. Holcombe is an employee of Peterson. (Deposition testimony of Peterson employee and grower, David Holcombe, Exhibit No. 1, p. 3)

2. Poultry Defendants acknowledge that the Poultry Defendants control the genetics and breeding stock of birds placed with their contract growers to attempt to achieve the highest performance for the contract growers and, in turn, improve the end product that each contract grower provides.

3. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because it is argumentative and incorrectly equates manure and litter to be one and the same substance. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the testimony of David Holcombe, Peterson employee and grower, which is that it has generally been the practice in the industry for growers to either sell their chicken litter, give it away or apply it to their own land. Mr. Holcombe did not testify

concerning Peterson's knowledge of this practice or that such practice had been going on since the 1950's. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, Exhibit 3; Deposition testimony of Peterson employee and grower David Holcombe, pp. 58-59) Plaintiffs also mischaracterize Ron Mullikin's testimony. Mr. Mullikin, a former Peterson employee, not a "Peterson representative" as plaintiffs' denominate Mr. Mullikin, testified that he could only speculate that growers in the Northeast Oklahoma and Northwest Arkansas area had been land applying chicken litter for as long as they had been growing chickens, and that this could have been done for decades. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, Exhibit 5; Deposition testimony of Ron Mullikin, pp. 167-169)

4. Plaintiffs' mischaracterize Schaffer's testimony. The poultry industry has been aware of the environmental impact of nitrogen contained in chicken litter since the late 1980s but did not become aware of the environmental impact of phosphorus or phosphates contained in chicken litter until approximately the mid-1990s. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, Exhibit 4; Deposition of Tyson Representative, Archie Schaffer, p. 43, lines 20-25) The Poultry Defendants also dispute this paragraph because it mischaracterizes Mr. Simmons' testimony. The question that was posed to Mr. Simmons was a very broad question and did not contain "environmental impact" as a topic, nor did it contain phosphorus as a topic. The portion of Mr. Simmons' deposition which is attached to Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support as Exhibit 7 reflects the true and correct question and answer exchange.

The Poultry Defendants also dispute this paragraph because the Plaintiffs' statement that the "poultry industry has been aware since at least the late 1980's" of potential environmental risks from the land application of chicken manure is misleading

Until very recently, the primary concerns of agronomists and the NRCS has been nitrogen, not phosphorus. Agronomists, soil scientists, NRCS in multiple states, and various state agencies are in the process of developing appropriate guidelines for the land application of poultry litter with a present focus on phosphorus. In the past, the focus was primarily on nitrogen. In fact, Plaintiffs' designated expert in the area of soil science, Dr. Jarrell, admits that Nutrient Management Plans in his state are still nitrogen-based. (Deposition of Dr. Jarrell, Exhibit No. 2, pp. 22 – 24, ll. 20-10). Dr. Jarrell further explained that we now have better tools for understanding phosphorus that were not available in the past. (Deposition of Dr. Jarrell, Exhibit No. 2, p. 17, ll. 6-17). Many states are in the process of developing methods to determine appropriate guidelines for the land application of poultry manure. Dr. Jarrell plans to spend another two years to validate the Wisconsin phosphorus index. (Deposition of Dr. Jarrell, Exhibit No. 2, p. 24, ll. 7-10). While there is a recognition that a potential risk may be present, there is no consensus as to when land application of poultry litter actually poses a risk. The Poultry Defendants' expert agronomist, Dr. Tucker, testified that in his fifty years of experience, he has never found a field saturated with phosphorus. There is no data or evidence that fields or pastures with high Soil Test Phosphorus[1] readings cause any harm or loading to waters. (Deposition of Dr. Tucker, Exhibit No. 3, p. 31, and p.36).

Furthermore, Plaintiffs' statement that "the poultry industry is aware" is not supported by the record for purposes of the motion. In support of this contention, Plaintiffs' cite the deposition testimony of a Simmons' representative and a Tysons' representative. Plaintiffs decided to sue six companies that have operations in Northwest

1 As explained in response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary judgment on Issue of Liability Under CERCLA, response to Plaintiffs' statement of fact No. 18, the topic of "Soil Test Phosphorus" will

Arkansas. However, the poultry industry is certainly much larger than the six Defendants Plaintiffs sued and the two representatives Plaintiffs' cite for purposes of this motion.

5. Plaintiffs' mischaracterize Mr. Schaffer's testimony. His testimony was that the document adopted by Tyson and referred to in this paragraph was used to educate Tyson's contract growers on Best Management Practices in general. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, Exhibit 4; Deposition of Tyson Representative, Archie Schaffer, p. 46, lines 12-14) Mr. Schaffer did not state that the document was adopted or otherwise used to educate the growers about potential environmental risks from land application of poultry manure and litter

6. The Poultry Defendants dispute Plaintiffs' characterization or summary of the seminar materials. The seminar materials (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 9) are of no less than thirty-five (35) pages and contain numerous findings. Plaintiffs' attempt to distill those reports down to four (4) conclusions which Plaintiffs' believe are beneficial to their arguments herein is improper and inaccurate. The 1994 paper from a research conference is interesting, but does not support any statement of fact material to this Court's ruling. Plaintiffs provide no explanation as to the origin of this document, the nature of the "research conference" from which this document appears to be generated, who was invited to attend the conference and who actually attended. Plaintiffs fail to demonstrate that any representatives of the Poultry Defendants had any knowledge of the "research conference" or this paper. Furthermore, the referenced seminar materials constitute inadmissible hearsay, and accordingly any references to these materials should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

---

be the subject of extensive expert testimony at trial.

In addition, the paper shows that at the time it was published, phosphorus research was still developing. One of the presenters at this "research conference" advised that "soils and management practices that are vulnerable to P (phosphorus) loss, must be identified to implement effective and economically viable management systems that minimize P transport." (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, Exhibit 9, p. 3) This demonstrates that at the time the paper was published, these management practices were being identified and researched by these scientists. The paper certainly does not go so far as to make specific recommendations relating to the soils in this Watershed. Furthermore, the paper does not demonstrate any type of consensus among the experts as to what might be considered excessive phosphorus levels. This study of phosphorus reactions in the soil and water is still developing and will be the subject of extensive expert testimony at trial.

7. Poultry Defendants dispute the plaintiffs' summary of the Poultry Water Quality Consortium's findings because the plaintiffs ignore significant and relevant aspects of the report. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 10) For example, the report recognized that:

> Properly managed poultry wastes from manure, litter, dead birds, and wastewater are profitable farm investments. An effective waste management plan provides for the proper collection, storage, handling, and use of poultry waste. Products produced from wastes reduce chemical fertilizer costs, improve soil quality, and protect water resources, air quality, and human and animal health.

Nonetheless, the referenced third-party materials constitute inadmissible hearsay, and accordingly any references to these materials should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

8. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the report entitled, "Confined Animal Inventory: Lake Eucha Watershed." (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 11) The report contains numerous findings, but Plaintiffs' statement of fact attempts to distill the report down to one (1) conclusion. Moreover, plaintiffs use this report as the basis for "undisputed" statements of fact and further rely upon it in their argument, yet the report amounts to hearsay and the calculations contained within it are flawed. The report is flawed because, for example, it states "[o]ur calculations assume that growers are running their houses at maximum capacity, but this is often not the case. Many growers will only raise three or four flocks a year rather than five which is the maximum possible." (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 11, p. 3) The report should further be excluded from business because it cannot be admitted into evidence in lieu of plaintiffs' experts' own opinions and testimony. This Court should exclude this report in its entirety when viewing this Motion because the plaintiffs are attempting to use it against the Poultry Defendants as if it were an additional expert witness report. However, it is not a report of a designated expert and the Poultry Defendants have not been able to depose the report's author prior to trial and they will not be able to cross-examine the author at trial. As an unsponsored, unsubstantiated, and unreliable expert witness report, it should be excluded in its entirety.

9. For the same reasons set forth in paragraph 8, *supra*, the Poultry Defendants dispute this report and plaintiffs' reliance on it as a basis for "undisputed" facts and argument. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 12)

10. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because it omits probative and relevant information contained in the referenced Exhibit. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 13) For example, the plaintiffs omit that Mr. Wagner identified wastewater

treatment plants, cattle operations, human waste and background sources as other potential sources of phosphorus. Poultry Defendants further dispute this paragraph with respect to the contributions Mr. Wagner attributes to the Poultry Defendants because those approximations were compiled and supplied by Mr. Wagner who the Poultry Defendants have no control over and whose calculations the Poultry Defendants cannot verify and therefore cannot admit to the them.

11. Poultry Defendants dispute Plaintiffs' characterization or summary of the referenced letter. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 14) The letter consists of numerous paragraphs that make multiple points. Plaintiffs' biased summation of the letter in two sentences is improper and inaccurate.

12. Poultry Defendants dispute Plaintiffs' characterization or summary of the letter. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 15) The letter contains numerous estimations, calculations and approximations and plaintiffs' attempt to summarize it in only two sentences is improper and inaccurate. Furthermore, the referenced third-party communication constituted inadmissible hearsay, and accordingly any references to this communication should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

13. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because it is incomplete and an inaccurate representation of the information contained in the memorandum. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 16) The quotation provided by plaintiffs is incomplete and is disputed because the plaintiffs omitted five full paragraphs of the memorandum. Plaintiffs' reduction of the memorandum to a meager portion they deem useful is an inaccurate statement of fact. Furthermore, the referenced third-party

communication constituted inadmissible hearsay, and accordingly any references to this communication should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

14. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because the quotation provided is incomplete and is disputed in the absence of the following information needed to make it complete. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit No. 17) At the "***" plaintiffs omitted the following:

> The Oklahoma Broiler Council has proposed an eight point plan for a cooperative approach to poultry litter management. The Oklahoma Department of Agriculture has accepted this proposal with some modifications. The ODA is presently writing regulations to put the plan into action. ****

Following the last sentence of the quotation provided by plaintiffs', the plaintiffs' omitted the following:

> If you have applied and are waiting for your plan to be formalized, please continue to use the "Dry Poultry Litter Handling Best Management Guidelines."

15. Poultry Defendants dispute the quoted portion of the letter referred to in plaintiffs' Statement No. 15 because it states in the final paragraph "Please write a letter to Governor Keating as soon as possible and tell him that you are concerned about water quality and the environment . . ." not "water quality in the environment" as stated by plaintiffs. (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 18).

16. Poultry Defendants dispute plaintiffs' biased abstract of the Task Force's Final Report. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit No. 19) That is a report containing numerous findings, but plaintiffs' attempt to summarize only a portion of it. Furthermore, the referenced third-party communication constituted inadmissible hearsay,

and accordingly any references to this communication should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

17. Poultry Defendants acknowledge that a meeting occurred on or about December 5, 1997 and that at that meeting plaintiffs' and some of the Poultry Defendants discussed Tulsa's water supply. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit No. 20) Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph to the extent that it makes inaccurate representations of the minutes of the recorded minutes of that meeting. Furthermore, the referenced third-party communication constituted inadmissible hearsay, and accordingly any references to this communication should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

18. Poultry Defendants dispute plaintiffs' characterization and summary of this letter. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 21) The letter is a lengthy response to concerns voiced by plaintiffs during their meeting with some of the Poultry Defendants on December 5, 1997. The letter contains a detailed twelve (12) step process responding to plaintiffs' concerns. Plaintiffs' quotation of only one introductory paragraph is improper and inaccurate. Furthermore, the referenced third-party communication constituted inadmissible hearsay, and accordingly any references to this communication should be stricken as an improper basis for summary judgment.

19. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because the information provided in this paragraph is incomplete and is disputed in the absence of noting that after the growers were informed of potential problems with land application of litter, they were encouraged to apply for a Farm Management Plan and encouraged to have soil samples taken before spreading any poultry litter.

20. Tyson Foods admits this paragraph.

21. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because the quotation provided is incomplete and disputed in the absence of the following. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 24) At the *** plaintiffs omitted the following brief but important sentence: "Your serviceman can help you with this." The following paragraph was also omitted:

> If you haven't already done so, we strongly urge you to contact your Natural Resources Conservation Service (the old Soil Conservation Office) and request that they help you develop a Nutrient Management Plan. Doing this can help the industry avoid government regulations that could make litter handling even more difficult.

Plaintiffs' biased summarizations of documents and meetings, their quotation out of context of letters, reports, and memoranda, and their deliberate censorship of references that negate their argumentative versions of facts are improper and inaccurate.

22. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because plaintiffs' Statement No. 22 is incomplete and misleading. Ron Mullikin, a former Peterson employee, explained at his deposition when questioned about the first sentence quoted by plaintiffs in Statement No. 22, "I think the statement there was one where I didn't feel equipped, didn't feel like I knew enough about everything that was going on to have an opinion about it." (Deposition of Ron Mullikin, Exhibit No. 4, p. 75) Mr Mullikin testified that he left Peterson in August, 2000, and that he currently is employed by Wal-Mart. Mr. Mullikin stated that he had gone to work for Peterson as director of training in November, 1997, and came to have human resources and environmental responsibilities six to nine months later and did not have a background in the poultry industry. (Deposition of Ron Mullikin, Exhibit No. 4, pp. 15, 17-18, 20) In his deposition, Mr. Mullikin stated that the

first meeting that he attended concerning the growing issue of poultry litter and concerns are over problems that it could be creating was in February or March of 1998 with attendees from the States of Oklahoma and Arkansas, the USDA and the University of Oklahoma and OSU. Mr. Mullikin further testified that the ideas and perceptions presented at the meeting no one could really substantiate and what he recalls from the first meeting is almost confusion trying to understand what the problem was, what all the determining factors were and what all the inputs were. (Deposition of Ron Mullikin deposition, Exhibit No. 4, pp. 21-22, 29) A section of the Opinions on the Poultry Litter Issues Memo not quoted in Statement No. 22, states "We are also faced with a lack of science to help us understand where we are, and where we need to go. Agronomists can't agree on the movement of phosphate, the water solubility of the P in the litter, and means of making P more efficient in our feeds. How much P in our soils is too much? Agencies can't agree on max. soil levels. And if they could agree, how would they measure it? In our few check samples, we demonstrated how hard it is to get a good accurate sample." (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 25).

23. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because plaintiffs' Statement No. 23 again incorrectly refers to Peterson's former employee Ron Mullikin as a "Peterson representative." Statement No. 23 is again incomplete and misleading. The memorandum referred to in Statement No. 23, whose subject is "Spavinaw Watershed Waste Management Plan Meeting," describes a meeting held to help growers in developing their own waste management plan which was sponsored by the NRCS and the Extension Service. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 26) Mr. Mullikin in his deposition explained the phosphorus limit of 300 pounds referred to in the memorandum:

"The 300 pounds was an arbitrary number. It was a number that, once again, [was] not based on science. It was a number that someone -- I don't recall if it was the NRCS. I don't recall if it was the extension service, whether it was -- I think in the State of Oklahoma it was mandated by legislation." (Deposition of Ron Mullikin, Exhibit No. 4, , p. 113)

24. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because plaintiffs' Statement No. 24 incorrectly refers to former employee Ron Mullikin as "Peterson's environmental representative." In response to the deposition question posed by plaintiffs' counsel, "Did you come to some belief by the time you left the company as to what portion or percentage of the problem might be caused by the poultry industry?" Mr. Mullikin answered "I believe that there could be phosphate in the lake that came from the soils that had poultry litter applied to them; but to be able to exact those numbers, I wouldn't -- I don't think anybody can." (Emphasis added). (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 5; Mullikin deposition, pp. 40-41) During plaintiffs' counsel's deposition questioning of Mr. Mullikin concerning a December, 1997 U.S. Senate report concerning the potential for animal waste pollution, the following colloquy occurred:

> **Q.** Would you look at page 4? I think it's the next page maybe, at the bottom talking about environmental impact. They first talk about spills directly into the water have an impact. It goes on to say 'In addition, the excessive growth and decay of algae and other aquatic organisms that feed on excessive nutrients in water deplete dissolved oxygen. The resulting hypoxia (low oxygen) from chronic nutrient enrichment can result in fish kills, odor and overall degradation of water quality'. (Emphasis added). Do you agree with that statement, Mr. Mullikin?
>
> **A.** Based on what I know, yes.
>
> **Q.** Did you know that in February of 1998 when you started this job?
>
> **A.** Yes.

(Deposition of Ron Mullikin, Exhibit No. 4, pp. 68-69) Finally, plaintiffs mischaracterize in misleading fashion, Mr. Mullikin's memo dated November 24, 1998 and deposition testimony concerning this memo. Mr. Mullikin" frustration is not due to lack of action to address the issues as argued by plaintiffs in Statement No. 24, but rather with his inability to find any new solutions to the issues. As he states in his final paragraph of this memo: "I realize once again I've come with no new solutions, but we continue to look at anything that may solve all or part of our problem." (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 5; Mullikin deposition pp. 142-144 & Exhibit 27, memo dated November 24, 1998)

25. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because plaintiffs misstate and mischaracterize the deposition testimony of David Holcombe in plaintiffs' Statement No. 25. Mr. Holcombe testified that at the 1999 Peterson meeting with growers, there were general comments about the water, the issues that were facing the industry and telling the growers that there were issues out there to be concerned with and to make sure that the growers applied their litter according to their waste management plans. Mr. Holcombe testified that the main part of the discussion was how the growers were going to work with their litter, what the growers did with their litter and how to apply the litter. The growers were told that water quality was an issue that they needed to be concerned about. (See: Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, Exhibit 3; Holcombe Deposition, pp. 60-62)

26. Poultry Defendants do not dispute that Cargill met with its contract growers on a regular basis to provide education, guidance, and best management practices on waste management and disposal matters.

27. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because it is incomplete. It is incomplete because the plaintiffs omitted the following before the quoted portion provided by the plaintiffs begins:

> It was because we were so involved with the City of Tulsa looking at the lake and quality, and so our first deal was that we can take our litter out.

The plaintiffs also omitted the following, which should be included in the plaintiffs' "quote" following the first ***:

> We did it [because] it was something that we could do. We were trying to identify what we could do to help solve the problem. And so we said we don't have all the answers, but we can take our litter out, and we were trying to educate our growers through meetings. Extension people helped put those meetings on too.

28. Tyson Foods admits this paragraph

29. Tyson Foods admits this paragraph.

30. Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because the quotation provided in this paragraph is incomplete and disputed in the absence of the following. At the *** plaintiffs omitted the following portion of the quotation: "[w]e are a little chagrined that we have received no acknowledgement of that effort (much less credit) from the Tulsa World and others, who refuse to accept the fact that there are lots of other contributors of phosphorous to the watershed, in addition to poultry."

31. With respect to Paragraph Thirty-One of the plaintiffs' Statement of Undisputed Facts, the Poultry Defendants dispute this paragraph because the quotation is incomplete and disputed in the absence of the following. At the *** plaintiffs omitted the following portion of the quotation: "[t]he practice of rotating crops and application sites will help remove excess phosphorus. Maintaining soil pH between 6.0 and 7.0, maximizes plant phosphorus uptake, thereby reducing accumulations."

DISCUSSION

PROPOSITION I

THE POULTRY DEFENDANTS ARE NOT LIABLE FOR THE ACTS OF INDEPENDENT CONTRACT GROWERS IN THE WATERSHED BASED ON THEIR NORMAL AND EXPECTED CONTRACT OPERATIONS.

A. Plaintiffs' Legal Authorities Do Not Establish a Basis for the Court to Override the Independent Contractor Status of Contract Growers.

Plaintiffs hope to convince the Court to enforce a limited exception to the general rule that an employer is not liable for the acts of an independent contractor. The caselaw and authorities offered by plaintiffs have little or no persuasive value because they are either wholly irrelevant or factually distinguishable.

In Weinman v. DePalma, 232 U.S. 571 (1914), the United States Supreme Court did identify an exception to the general rule of no liability for the acts of an independent contractor where the "work performed itself" is a nuisance or injures or destroys the property of another. Id. at 576 This statement helped create what is now referred to as the inherently dangerous activity exception to the general rule of no liability.

In attempting to apply the exception of Weinman to the factual circumstances of contract growers, plaintiffs stretch the holding of Weinman beyond the breaking point. The Weinman exception is not, as the plaintiffs would have the Court believe, that the employer is liable if a nuisance is likely to result; instead, the exception states that where the work actually performed is a nuisance or injures or destroys the property of another, the principal can be liable. Here, that is not the case because the work actually performed under the contract (i.e. growing chickens) does not inherently result in any nuisance.

Plaintiffs offer the case of Bleeda v. Hickman-Williams, 205 N.W.2d 85 (Mich. Ct. App. 1973), and a series of similar cases, all of which are factually distinguishable because in none of them is there a bargained for exchange between the employer and the independent contractor whereby the independent contractor gains control of the item or substance that a plaintiff alleges causes the nuisance. Additionally, in none of the cited cases does the alleged nuisance-causing substance have economic value to the independent contractor. In Bleeda, the employer was found liable for acts that occurred while the independent contractor delivered its employer's product to its employer's customers. Bleeda, 205 N.W.2d at 87

Here, that is simply not the case as the alleged nuisance occurs when the contract grower exercises its exclusive ownership and control over litter. It is not until after the contract growers have completed their work (i.e. growing chickens) that the alleged nuisance could potentially arise.

In Bleeda, the employer knew that the process itself caused a nuisance (it created dust and odor), but continued to use the services of the independent contractor to size and screen its coke and ultimately deliver it to the employer's customers (a fact not present herein). Here, the Poultry Defendants contract with their contract growers to raise chickens, and the contract growers are the contractual owners of litter. It is not until the grower asserts control over the litter that the alleged nuisance can arise. It is not the work contracted to be performed that creates the alleged nuisance; it is a separate and distinct act that creates the alleged nuisance.

In McQuilken v. A&R Dev. Corp., 576 F.Supp. 1023 (E.D. Penn. 1983), the court found that the employer of an independent contractor can be liable when the contractor is

employed to do work that the employer knows or has reason to "recognize that, in the ordinary course of doing the work ... the trespass or nuisance is likely to result." McQuilken, 576 F.Supp. at 1033; quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 427B (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 21) Here, in the ordinary course of contracting with independent growers to raise chickens, there is no way for the Poultry Defendants to know or have reason to know that a nuisance or trespass will occur. As acknowledged, poultry litter has long been recognized as a valuable soil supplement for agronomic uses, which the contract growers are free to use as permitted by their nutrient management plans, or to sell for the use by others. Again, the Poultry Defendants have a right to assume that under the contract that the grower will make use of the litter in a manner consistent with applicable law.

Plaintiffs rely on Amoco Pipeline Co. v. Herman Drainage Sys., Inc., 212 F.Supp.2d 710 (W.D. Mich. 2002)(Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 17), as a basis for ignoring independent contractor status. Because the Amoco case involves the "abnormally dangerous activities" exception, it has little relevance to the matter at hand, as it has not been pled by plaintiffs that either the raising of poultry or the application of litter is inherently dangerous. In Amoco, an employer / farmer employed an independent contractor to excavate a site on his farm. The farmer had actual knowledge of a petrochemical pipeline that cut through the farm his property near the location of the excavation but failed to inform the independent contractor of the existence of the pipeline. The Poultry Defendants cannot be aware of this type of special risk or abnormally dangerous activity because one simply is not present and as such this case has

little if any precedental persuasive value to the matter at hand, and thus the case does not support the plaintiffs' contention.

Another case of plaintiffs' involving the "inherently dangerous activities" exception is U.S. v. Aceto Agr. Chem. Corp., 699 F.Supp. 1384 (S.D. Iowa). (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, p. 18) The Aceto case addresses the manufacture and disposal of pesticides and pesticide by-products and whether an employer arranged for the disposal of hazardous waste by-products under the guise of the contract. Aceto, 699 F.Supp. at 1387, 1389 The Aceto case concerned the disposal of a substance listed as hazardous under CERCLA. Conveniently, via their Motion in Limine, the plaintiffs are attempting to prevent the Poultry Defendants from showing a jury that litter is not classified as hazardous under any regulatory scheme. At any rate, because litter is not hazardous under CERCLA and is in no way abnormally dangerous, the cited case is absolutely irrelevant to the case at bar.

The court in Shannon v. Mo. Valley Limestone Co., 122 N.W.2d 278 (Iowa 1963), recognized that an employer of independent contractors has a duty to suppress a nuisance created by its independent contractors where the work being performed is the cause of the nuisance. Id. at 280 (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 18) This proposition is also found in the case of Peairs v. Fla. Publ'g Co., 132 So.2d 561 (Fla. Ct. App 1961) where the court stated where an employer gains knowledge of a "dangerous situation," it may be liable if it fails to halt or correct the situation. Peairs, 132 So.2d at 565 (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 20) Herein, even if the work performed (growing chickens) did cause the alleged nuisance, which it does not, the work did not create the alleged nuisance in all situations. In fact, many of the farmers in the Watershed transport their

litter out of the Watershed and thus cannot contribute even theoretically to the alleged nuisance. Furthermore, there is a marketplace for poultry litter, whereby third parties buy the litter for their own uses, both within and without the Watershed, all of which is clearly outside the control of the Poultry Defendants. The alleged nuisance complained of by the plaintiffs does not amount to a "dangerous situation" or abnormally dangerous activity – in fact, plaintiffs' own experts will testify that the phosphorus from any one area receiving litter in and of itself is most likely not damaging to the environment, but is only damaging if it reaches certain concentrated levels in a given geographical area in the aggregate from all sources. Thus, poultry litter is not inherently or abnormally dangerous or a nuisance in and of itself.

Moreover, even if an alleged nuisance or dangerous situation did arise in every situation, which it does not, when the Poultry Defendants became aware of concerns regarding phosphorus in the Watershed, they implemented Best Management Practices and other measures to abate prospective or alleged nuisances, despite the fact that the alleged nuisance (i.e. all phosphorus from all sources aggregated in the watershed) was not created by the Poultry Defendants' conduct. If anything, the Poultry Defendants acted voluntarily to help educate the contract growers on litter management, and they cannot be held liable under the cases presented by plaintiffs because, in all of those cases, plaintiffs rely upon an employer's failure to act to abate or control the nuisance created by the acts of its contractors.

After touching upon the law of numerous and non-controlling jurisdictions, plaintiffs finally address Oklahoma law in one paragraph on pages 21-22 of their Motion and Brief. In 1925, the Oklahoma Supreme Court found that an employer is subject to

liability where actions in conformance with the ordinary performance of a contract necessarily or naturally result in a nuisance. Tankersly v. Webster, 243 P.2d 745, 747 (Okla. 1925)(Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 21) This case is also without precedental value as the Tankersly court noted that the rule plaintiffs urge on this Court did not even apply in that case. Plaintiffs have failed to produce any Oklahoma case that applies the rule mentioned in Tankersly. Moreover, the Tankersly is further inapplicable because it, too, involved an abnormally dangerous situation, not an alleged nuisance or trespass.

For numerous reasons the plaintiffs' argument that this exception applies is misplaced. Case law and facts at hand demonstrate the following:

> 1. No Oklahoma case has applied the exception in the manner in which plaintiffs' urge on this Court. The only case from Oklahoma that plaintiffs' cite for a similar proposition is almost eighty years old, does not apply factually, and does not adopt the rule plaintiffs seek to impose upon the Poultry Defendants.
>
> 2. The Poultry Defendants were not aware until the 1990's that phosphorus presented potential problems to the Watershed; the Poultry Defendants then began implementation of measures to educate their contract growers about litter management issues and to prevent and abate phosphorus concerns. Even, plaintiffs admit that it was not until 1996 or 1997 that the Poultry Defendants became aware of potential problems presented by phosphorus. (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 22) Plaintiffs' repeated and unfounded allegations that Poultry Defendants have known for decades about this problem are both erroneous and irrelevant, as they are only red herrings put forth to confuse the issue.
>
> 3. The Poultry Defendants have taken tangible, reasonable steps to restrict the amounts of phosphorus generated in the Watershed through land application operations within the limits allowed by their contracts with their growers. The fact of the matter is that the plaintiffs are so fixated on poultry operations that they will only be satisfied with the total cessation of all poultry operations in

> the Watershed, an action that would not help the Water Supply in the short term, but would certainly be economically devastating to numerous independent contract growers who are not before this Court.

These facts in no way trigger the exception with which plaintiffs proselytize the Court. For all of these reasons, this Court should decline to apply the plaintiffs' proposed exception and, accordingly, the Court should deny the plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on this issue.

PROPOSITION II

LAND APPLICATION OF LITTER DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A NUISANCE *PER SE*.

A. Plaintiffs' Legal Authorities Do Not Establish a Basis for the Court to Find as a Matter of Law that Land Application of Poultry Litter is a Nuisance *Per Se*.

1. Caselaw cited by plaintiffs does not establish that poultry litter is a nuisance *per se*.

Throughout their pleadings plaintiffs continually refer to manure and litter interchangeably as if they are the same substance, when that simply is not the case. However, because litter is a combination of manure and rice hulls or wood chips on an approximately 50-50 ratio, the two substances are quite distinct. Plaintiffs continuing referral to the substances as being equal is merely inflammatory, and erroneous.

Plaintiffs' cite three (3) cases for the proposition that animal manure (not poultry litter) has been found to be a pollutant. (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, p. 23) Those cases are: Concerned Area Residents for the Env't v. Southview Farm, 834 F.Supp 1410 (W.D.N.Y. 1993)("CARE") reversed 34 F.3d 114; Carr v. Alta Verde Indus. Inc., 931 F.2d 1055 (5th Cir. 1991)(NPDES permit case); and, Higbee v. Starr, 598 F.Supp. 323 (E.D. Ark. 1984). However, CARE and Higbee are the only cases even remotely on

point regarding manure (not litter) as a pollutant. In each of these cases, the issue is the classification of liquid (not solid) swine waste that falls directly from swine contained in a Confined Animal Feeding Operation through floor "slats" and into holding lagoons without being mixed with any substance (e.g. rice hulls or shavings) to begin breaking down and diluting the nutrients contained in the waste. In each of the cases relied upon by plaintiffs for this proposition, the manure was not a solid, and was not mixed with any other substance to reduce or change its composition, making it potentially more susceptible to runoff. Here, plaintiffs are attempting to have litter equated to liquefied swine manure and/or attempt to treat litter the same as manure under the Clean Water Act and the cases cited in their Brief, which is simply not the case and is merely an effort to mislead the Court by clouding the issue with irrelevant comparisons. The two substances differ to such a fundamental extent that they cannot be considered equivalents for purposes of rhetoric or for application of case law.

2. Oklahoma Statutes cited by plaintiffs do not establish that poultry litter is a nuisance *per se*.

Plaintiffs' hope to convince the Court to trigger the public nuisance provisions of Oklahoma law based on invocations of statutory definitions which include manure (not poultry litter) as a pollutant. Plaintiffs' attempt is misplaced.

First, Title 27A, Section 2-6-105, in addition to the terms relied upon by the plaintiffs, further requires that where the Executive Director finds that water has been polluted he should order the pollution to cease or order actions intended to prevent the pollution in the future. 27A O.S. §2-6-105(B) In this matter the Executive Director has not made any such finding or order.

Moreover, as acknowledged by the plaintiffs, there is no conflict between section 27A and the general public nuisance law found in Title 50 of the *Oklahoma Statutes*. (Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in Support, p. 25) Section 1.1 of Title 50 provides:

> Agricultural activities conducted on farm or ranch land, if consistent with good agricultural practices and established prior to nearby nonagricultural activities, are presumed to be reasonable and do not constitute a nuisance unless the activity has a substantial adverse affect on the public health and safety.

50 O.S. §1.1(B)

Here, the actions plaintiffs complain of do not constitute a nuisance. To date, it has not been established that the manner in which the contract growers handle their litter has (beyond mere allegations) a substantial adverse affect on public health or safety. As such, litter application in the Watershed and the alleged consequences of that application by the contract growers is reasonable and does not amount to a nuisance *per se*. Because the Poultry Defendants have not allowed manure to enter waters of the State of Oklahoma and because litter application practices of contract growers have always been consistent with good agricultural practices, land application of litter is not a nuisance *per se*.

PROPOSITION III

PLAINTIFFS HAVE FAILED TO SHOW THAT THE POULTRY DEFENDANTS ARE LIABLE AS A MATTER OF LAW FOR VIOLATING STATUTES REGARDING THE POLLUTION OF A MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY.

Plaintiffs failed to show that the Poultry Defendants are liable under the "normal and expected contract operations" exception to the general rule that there is no liability for an employer of an independent contractor, or that the "abnormally dangerous activities" exception applies. Plaintiffs have failed to show that litter (not manure) is

considered by any of the authorities (e.g. CWA, RCRA, case law, and/or statutes) to be a pollutant or otherwise considered to be a hazardous substance. Plaintiffs have also failed to show that the agriculture practices engaged in by the contract growers in the Watershed are not consistent with good agricultural practices. As such, plaintiffs' failed to show that there is no genuine issue regarding each of those facts and, accordingly, they are not entitled to judgment as a matter of law as to any of them.

POULTRY DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE

Alternatively to denying Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief, the Poultry Defendants assert that because the plaintiffs have not raised this theory of the case at any time prior to this Motion, this Motion should, in the interest of not rewarding unfair surprise and in the interests of fair play and substantial justice, be stricken in its entirety.

Rule 12(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure states in pertinent part as follows:

> (f) Motion to Strike. Upon motion made by a party before responding to a pleading or ... upon the court's own initiative at any time, the court may order stricken from any pleading any insufficient defense or any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f) (Supp. 2000)(emphasis added).

Rule 12(f) provides a court the impetus to strike, either by its own initiative or upon proper motion, redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous information contained in any pleading or to strike the pleading in its entirety. A Rule 12(f) Motion does not challenge the pleading on its face, but merely challenges the timeliness, relevance and / or materiality of information contained in the pleading. The motion may be used to strike allegations or information in the pleading that do not help understand the plaintiff's claim for relief and/ or do not perform some other useful purpose in promoting the just disposition of the litigation.

See Wright & Miller "Federal Practice & Procedure" § 1380-1382. In addition, Rule 12(f) motions are used to challenge allegations and information contained in the pleading that are unworthy of consideration by the court because they are so unrelated to the plaintiff's cause of action that it would be unnecessary, burdensome, or unjust to require a defendant to respond.

Via their Motion and Brief, plaintiffs for the very first time, just two months out from trial, present a radically different theory of the case from that which they have relied on or disclosed to date. Until the plaintiffs filed their Motion and Brief they have relied solely upon their contention that the Poultry Defendants exercise so much control over their contract growers that the contract growers are not actually independent contractors but are agents of the Poultry Defendants. This assertion was the basis of their theory of liability in their original Complaint and in their Amended Complaint. (See generally: Complaint, ¶¶ 17-22 & Amended Complaint, ¶¶ 17-22)

Now, apparently recognizing flaws in their argument, plaintiffs attempt to change course and assert a new and dramatically different theory of liability. They did not choose to assert this theory of liability until they filed the instant Motion, after depositions and discovery were completed or near completion, and thus the theory has not been investigated during the discovery process. If plaintiffs had disclosed this theory of liability at an earlier juncture then it would have drastically altered the Poultry Defendants discovery process, theories of the case, and defense strategy. Additionally, plaintiffs' new theory would have required additional discovery regarding the scientific aspects of the argument and the validity inquiries into the remote authorities relied upon by the plaintiffs regarding their argument.

In short, plaintiffs ambushed the Poultry Defendants with a new theory of liability that Poultry Defendants cannot properly defend against because discovery is closed. For these reasons, the Poultry Defendants request that this Court strike plaintiffs' Motion and Brief pursuant to Rule 12(f) of the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs have failed to show that there is an absence of material fact with regard to the alleged liability of the Poultry Defendants. Plaintiffs did not establish the normal and expected contract operations exception to the general rule that there is no liability for the acts of independent contractors. Plaintiffs failed to prove that litter (not manure) is a pollutant or hazardous material, beyond mere broad allegations. As such, the Poultry Defendants are not liable as a matter of law under any of the theories presented by the plaintiffs in their Motion and Brief. In the alternative, because the theory of recovery presented by the plaintiffs is radically different than any theory asserted to date, the Poultry Defendants request that the Court strike plaintiffs' Motion and Brief in its entirety.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Poultry Defendants respectfully request that this Court deny Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief for Partial Summary Judgment Against Poultry Defendants on Issue of Liability for Growers' Disposal of Poultry Manure or, in the alternative, that the Court will grant the Poultry Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Motion and Brief for Partial Summary Judgment Against Poultry Defendants on Issue of Liability for Growers' Disposal of Poultry Manure, and they further request any and all other relief to which they may be entitled.

By:

Gary V. Weeks
Vince Chadick (OB #15981)
James M. Graves (OB #16604)
BASSETT LAW FIRM
P.O. Box 3618
Fayetteville, AR 72702-3618
(479) 521-9996

AND

Richard Carpenter

Richard L. Carpenter, Jr. (OB #1504)
CARPENTER, MASON & McGOWAN
1516 S. Boston Avenue, Suite 205
Tulsa, OK 74119-4013
(918) 584-7400

Attorneys for George's, Inc. and also signing by consent of other Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have on this day served counsel for all parties in the foregoing matter with a true and correct copy of this pleading by depositing in the United States mail a copy properly addressed with adequate postage thereon.

DATED this 27th day of November, 2002.

Richard L. Carpenter, Jr.

0001

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

. THE CITY OF TULSA 2. THE TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY, Plaintiffs, vs. 1. TYSON FOODS, INC., 2. COBB-VANTRESS, INC., 3. PETERSON FARMS, INC., 4. SIMMONS FOODS, INC., 5. CARGILL, INC., 6. GEORGE'S, INC., 7. CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS, Defendants.	Case No. 01 CV 0900B(X)

DEPOSITION OF DAVID LEE HOLCOMBE
Taken at 221 North College, Fayetteville, Arkansas,
on August 8, 2002, at 9:00 a.m.

0002

APPEARANCES

MR. ROBERT L. ROARK McKinney & Stringer Corporate Tower 101 North Robinson, Suite 1300 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102 (405) 272-1901 (405) 239-7902 Fax	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS
MR. A. SCOTT McDANIEL Joyce, Paul & McDaniel, P.C. 111 West Fifth Street, Suite 500 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103 (918) 599-0700 (918) 732-5370 Fax	FOR THE DEFENDANT, PETERSON FARMS, INC.
MS. THERESA NOBLE HILL Rhodes, Hieronymus, Jones, Tucker & Gable, P.L.L.C. 100 West Fifth Street, Suite 400 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-4287 (918) 582-1173 (918) 592-3390 Fax	FOR THE DEFENDANT, CARGILL, INC.
MS. LINDA C. MARTIN Doerner, Saunders, Daniel & Anderson	FOR THE CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS

EXHIBIT
tabbies
1

22 A. Tuesday.
23 Q. Okay, sir.
24 A. Last Tuesday.
25 Q. About how long did you spend there?
0005
1 A. Probably two hours.
2 Q. Who all was present besides Mr. McDaniel?
3 A. Janet Wilkerson.
4 Q. Anyone else?
5 A. No.
6 Q. Okay. Are you employed by Peterson in any respect?
7 A. On a limited part-time basis.
8 Q. And what is your title or -- Tell me about that
9 part-time basis.
10 A. The title is probably somewhat misleading. I was
11 hired beginning of February, like I say, on a limited
12 part-time bases mainly to deal with water quality issues
13 and environmental issues that -- and attend meetings that
14 were having effect with the poultry industry for Peterson
15 Farms.
16 Q. So you are an employee of Peterson's?
17 A. Part-time.
18 Q. How many -- Do you have regular hours?
19 A. No, sir.
20 Q. How many hours a week do you work in that capacity?
21 A. Without going back and looking at the records, I
22 doubt that I have worked a total of ten hours a month.
23 Like I say, it's very limited.
24 Q. Who do you report to in that capacity?
25 A. Would be Janet Wilkerson.
0006
1 Q. And was this a job that was filled by someone else,
2 to your understanding, before you were hired part-time?
3 A. No, sir, not to my understanding.
4 Q. Is this a -- a position that was created more or
5 less when -- when they hired you?
6 A. Yes.
7 Q. And does it have an official title or name?
8 A. I think they've got it listed as environmental
9 employee, I believe is the way it's listed. Environmental
10 issues maybe.
11 Q. Okay, sir. And what is your compensation
12 arrangement for that job?
13 A. It's an hourly fee.
14 Q. And what is that?
15 A. $20 an hour.
16 Q. When you were hired, what were your -- how were your
17 duties explained to you?
18 A. What we had discussed was that as water quality
19 issues came up, as meetings came up pertaining to water
20 quality or environmental issues, I would probably attend
21 those meetings and bring that information back to the
22 company and dispense that information to them. Usually
23 that came back to Janet, and then they would take that
24 information and do whatever they needed to, you know, and
25 make their decisions with it.
0007
1 Q. And is your job limited solely to meeting with
2 out -- in outside meetings or conferences or wherever
3 water quality issues are the subject?
4 A. That's the basics, yes. There will be some meetings
5 that take place there at the office, but the majority of
6 it has been travel meetings.

COPY OF TRANSCRIPT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

THE CITY OF TULSA AND TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	No. 01CV0900B(C)
PETERSON FARMS, INC.; TYSON FOODS, INC.; GEORGE'S, INC.,; COBB-VANTRESS, INC.; CARGILL, INC.; SIMMONS FOODS, INC.; CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS,	)	
Defendants.	)	

DEPOSITION OF WESLEY M. JARRELL

TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS

ON NOVEMBER 5, 2002, BEGINNING AT 8:40 A.M.

IN TULSA, OKLAHOMA

APPEARANCES:

MR. KENNETH N. McKINNEY, Attorney at law, of The firm McKINNEY & STRINGER, 101 North Robinson, Suite 1300, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102, appeared for the **PLAINTIFF.**

MR. JOHN ELROD, Attorney at Law, of the CONNER & WINTERS firm, Suite 200, 100 West Center Street, Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701-6081, appeared for the **DEFENDANT SIMMONS FOODS.**

REPORTED BY: **KATHERINE A. POWELL, CSR, RPR, CRR**

EXHIBIT 2

Then wl. n I went to Riverside in 6, they were in the middle of nitrate work down there. They were early, but then phosphorous faded out in the late '70s, nitrate came in and has been a fairly dominant issue for some time.

Now there's a realization, and I think in part it's because we have better tools for understanding phosphorous than we ever had in the earlier days.

Q What has happened in science that has given us better tools to understand phosphorous?

A Well, the way we've looked at it, at least in our program, is geographic information systems, for example, GIS lets you look at the whole landscape, understand elements of it like slope, land management, soil type, where the water is, how much is coming out.

Computer modeling has certainly been an element that's something that wasn't particularly available 20 years ago, 30 years ago.

Q From your viewpoint, Dr. Jarrell, in the last 20 years has there been a particular scientist who has been a crusader for phosphorous?

A Well, the name that pops up all the time is Sharpley.

WORD INDEX CONDENSED TRANSCRIPT

number of those who will go into cash grains.

And a lot of those farmers value the nitrogen material and the phosphorous and the organic matter that they're getting out of the manure.

Q There's been a lot of talk in Oklahoma and Arkansas about something called a litter bank, which is nothing more than an informatio system for potential buyers and so on for chicke litter can come together, for instance. Is the sa sort of thing going on in Wisconsin in terms of dairy manure?

A That's a great idea. I haven't seen that level of development yet. My wife is actually working on some approaches that are similar to that in trying to get people who produce organic waste materials of all kinds to join together and try to create value-added products that are real beneficial.

Q Is there an equivalent of a phosphorou index in the Wisconsin regulatory scheme?

A Right. The 590 standard has a phosphorous index.

Q And that's actually in play right now in Wisconsin?

A It's not -- when the 590 standard becomes in effect, it will be in play. But that's -- initially, it was anticipated it would be this year, but it looks like it's pushed forward a couple of years.

Q Are there any other standards, other than a phosphorous index, that would tell a farmer whether or not he or she can apply animal manure to a particular field?

A Right. The way the 590 was written this round, it also includes a soil test phosphorous option.

Q Is that in play yet?

A No. Neither one are because the 590 isn't.

Q So right now it's totally laissez-faire?

A It is. It is. Yeah, as far as I'm aware, it's nitrogen-based still, which is the old standard.

Q But there is, then, some regulation that could prohibit a farmer from applying to a particular field animal manure?

A If -- when the 590 standard, if it gets inserted into the Department of Ag regulation, it would be.

Q So it's still something yet to come?

A That's correct. But there's an anticipa
date that looks relatively firm. The 590 was in
process when the last set of rules went through,
so it wasn't yet finalized. And they were not --
did not want, for good reason, to accept somethi
that wasn't finalized as the standard.

So our ideal is to work the next two year
very hard to get the phosphorous index more
validated over a wide range of areas and tested t
determine if it's doing its job.

Q Is there general acceptance among the
agricultural community that it is time to start
dealing with these kinds of issues?

A I would characterize it as reluctant
acceptance in many cases.

Q That's a good term. I like that.

A It's not embraced fully, but there's a
realization that it's coming and that the best wa
to deal with it -- and that's what Discovery Farm
are trying to do, I think, is to get out ahead of it
and be able to say this is what is happening on
the farm and this is what's happening with the
environment, and these are the benefits and cost
of the BMP's, for example, that you're asking us t
do, or sometimes telling us to do.

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA
2
3 THE CITY OF TULSA, and THE)
TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY)
4 AUTHORITY,)
Plaintiffs,)
5)
vs.) Case No. 01-CV-0900-B(C)
6)
)
7 TYSON FOODS, INC.,)
COBB-VANTRESS, INC., PETERSON)
8 FARMS, INC., SIMMONS FOODS, INC.,)
CARGILL, INC., GEORGE'S INC.,)
9 and THE CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS,)
)
10 Defendants.)

11
12
THE DEPOSITION OF BILLY B. TUCKER, Ph.D.,
13
taken on behalf of the Plaintiffs, pursuant to
14
agreement of the parties, on the 14th day of November
15
2002 at the law offices of Rhodes, Hieronymus, Jones,
16
Tucker & Gable, 400 ONEOK Plaza, Tulsa,
17
Oklahoma, 74103, before Elizabeth Roy Rockett,
18
Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the States of
19
Oklahoma and New York.
20
21 A p p e a r a n c e s
22
For the Plaintiffs: MR. KENNETH N. MC KINNEY, ESQ.
23 MR. ROBERT L. ROARK, ESQ.
McKinney & Stringer
24 Suite 1300
101 North Robinson
25 Oklahoma City, Oklah

EXHIBIT
3

of crops and it ought to be recycled and used.
Q. In a form that doesn't hurt water supplies?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you, even though you would say it differently, can you see that this is a statement that a competent scientist could make?
A. They did.
Q. The next paragraph starts out saying, "Several states have proposed standards that would limit manure application..." and so forth. It goes on to say standards may be based on nutrient utilization where manure is applied to meet phosphorus required for crop production. First, do you think that's accurate and correct?
A. Yes.
Q. It goes on to say, "Standards based on waste disposal exceed nutrient phosphorus crop requirement and allow for some buildup of soil phosphorus. Do you think that's correct?
A. I really don't understand the sentence standards based upon waste disposal exceed nutrient P crop requirement or the standards do allow for some buildup of soil. That's correct.
Q. If an application is in excess of plant needs, then it's being called here a waste disposal rather than a beneficial use?

A. Runoff from water?
Q. Runoff water, yes.
A. You can get runoff from water, but I don't think you carry the material. It's all the way to the creek.
Q. You don't?
A. Not generally.
Q. Let's say people think the weather is going to be nice and dry. You see how they spread this dusty, dry chicken manure on the field, haven't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You just take a truck and kind of spread it around. You've seen it blow around and everything else when they're applying it; does it not?
A. I haven't seen it -- I have seen it, you know, the dust blow out from it. But the manure itself dropped to the ground when I saw it.
Q. So if the weatherman happens to be wrong that week and a few days later if there's a pretty good rainfall, then why is it that the runoff is not going to carry with it some of that soluble feed that's been put right on top of the soil?
A. Over the soluble P?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I thought you were talking about the P in the --
Q. The high STP in, down in the soil itself?

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

THE CITY OF TULSA, THE TULSA METROPOLITAN UTILITY AUTHORITY, Plaintiffs,	No. 01 CV 0900B(X)
vs.	VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RONALD J. MULLIKIN
TYSON FOODS, INC., COBB-VANTRESS, INC., PETERSON FARMS, INC., SIMMONS FOODS, INC., CARGILL, INC., GEORGE'S, INC., CITY OF DECATUR, ARKANSAS, Defendants.	

COPY

THE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RONALD J. MULLIKIN, taken before Karen J. Eichmann, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of Iowa, commencing at 12:02 p.m., on the 18th day of July, 2002, at 421 West Broadway, Suite 405, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Reported by: Karen J. Eichmann, C.S.R.

EXHIBIT 4

1 regional sales manager.

2 Q. Where was your store as assistant

3 manager?

4 A. I was in Cross Lanes, West Virginia;

5 Freehold, New Jersey; Waterloo, Iowa.

6 Q. Then why did you leave them and go to

7 Peterson?

8 A. Well, I left them for health reasons

9 and because I wanted to live back in northwest

10 Iowa. I didn't leave -- or northwest Arkansas.

11 I didn't leave them because I wanted to go to

12 work for Peterson. I left them really without

13 having another job to go to and just took a

14 short sabbatical and then found the position at

15 Peterson.

16 Q. And started with Peterson when?

17 A. I believe it was in November of I

18 believe it was '97.

19 Q. And when did you leave Peterson?

20 A. Would have been in August of 2000, and

21 I think those dates are close.

22 Q. Then you left Peterson and went back

23 with Wal-Mart.

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. What's the reason that you left

of the divisions to the other.

Q. And you anticipate your position back in the home office will be what?

A. Most likely with Sam's Club. There's a couple of different things that we are negotiating on right now. I don't know exactly which position it will be that they finally put me in.

Q. So you can't tell me what your function will be then?

A. No.

Q. How would you rate your tenure with Peterson Farms as far as job satisfaction and things of that sort?

A. I enjoyed it. I especially enjoyed the environmental side of it, and I think it's because of my agricultural roots. Enjoyed the human resources part of it also. And the part that I was originally hired for, which was to be the director of training, I got to the point where we had people trained that did most of that; and I wasn't nearly as involved with it.

Q. So after that point you moved more into the environmental side?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Did you actually pick up an environmental title at that point?

A. I had the title of director of environmental affairs.

Q. From inception or later on?

A. No, later on.

Q. So at first director of training?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And then after how long?

A. I would have said that it would be probably six to nine months.

Q. So sometime you are thinking in mid or so 1998, you're named director of environmental affairs, did you say?

A. That became -- that became more of what I did. My involvement with the environment started out with being asked to simply attend a meeting and come back and report on what my feelings were. As I gained a better understanding of it and I think their comfort level with what I was doing and seeing grew, that is when they said to go ahead and dedicate more time to that.

Q. Was there a function in the company with that title before?

area once you took over?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Did those people report to you for environmental issues?

A. No. On many occasions I went to them for help just because I don't have a background in the poultry industry.

Q. But you did coordinate and work together with them after you became the director?

A. Yes.

Q. How would you describe Peterson Farms insofar as a commitment to environmental issues?

A. I would say that it was a huge concern.

Q. From the first when you became familiar with it?

A. I would have to say so or they wouldn't have put me in that position and started sending me to those meetings.

Q. What was the first meeting that you went to that you said sort of led to this assignment?

A. It was a meeting, and I don't recall the date, but it was a meeting at John Brown University. No, I take it back. It was at

Simmons Foods that we attended in Siloam Springs.

Q. A meeting at the Simmons Food facility?

A. Uh-huh, with integrators. There were people there from the state of Arkansas. There were people there from the USDA, people from Oklahoma, people from the University of Oklahoma, OU.

Q. OSU?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you saying both OU and OSU?

A. Yes.

Q. Approximately when was that meeting?

A. I would have to -- and this is a guess. Let's say that it was probably in February or March of '98.

Q. Three or four months after you had been with the company?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. What was your understanding of the purpose of the meeting?

A. Was to discuss the growing issue of poultry litter and concerns over problems that it could be creating.

Q. Primarily problems in watersheds?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And was the Spavinaw watershed one of those areas that was being discussed?

A. I don't recall it being talked about specifically. There were a number of watersheds and a number of things that were discussed, and I don't -- I don't recall the total content of the meeting.

Q. What did you bring away from that meeting? What kind of knowledge or feeling about this area?

A. Mr. McKinney, my first feeling, if I remember correctly, was one of confusion because the ideas the people had, the perceptions is probably the best way to put it, no one could really substantiate. There was nothing really clear and decisive about what everybody was talking about.

Through my years in the fertilizer business, my understanding the properties and the way that phosphate, for instance, acts and reacts in the soil was somewhat different than what I was hearing at those meetings.

Q. What had been your understanding and --

again.

Q. What typ of soil would be able to sustain that type of phosphorus load?

A. I couldn't tell you.

Q. What impressions did you come out of this initial meeting at Simmons Foods with?

MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

A. What I recall, once again, from that first meeting is one of almost confusion trying to understand what the problem was, what all the determining factors, what all the inputs were. And then I recall sitting down with Janet Wilkerson and us talking about what our role was or might be in the issues that were being spoken about.

Q. And Ms. Wilkerson's role was what, her function?

A. She was the vice president that I answered to. She was my direct report.

Q. What was her title? Vice president?

A. She was vice president of human resources.

Q. And in your training function, you had been reporting to her?

A. That's correct.

1 annual litter from a typical broiler house of
2 22,000 birds contains as much phosphorus as is
3 in the sewage from a community of 6,000 people."
4 Have you seen analyses and comparisons like
5 that?
6 A. I have seen comparisons. I don't know
7 if that number is correct or not.
8 Q. Would that surprise you to see that
9 kind of a comparison?
10 A. The comparison wouldn't, but there's so
11 many factors that go into it. I mean, that
12 statement really simplifies it. The different
13 feeds that they have has a tremendous impact on
14 the amount of phosphate, for instance, what the
15 ingredients are; and it's a pretty general
16 statement.
17 Q. Would you look at page 4. I think it's
18 the next page maybe, at the bottom talking about
19 environmental impact. They first talk about
20 spills directly into the water have an impact.
21 It goes on to say, "In addition, the excessive
22 growth and decay of algae and other aquatic
23 organisms that feed on excessive nutrients in
24 water deplete dissolved oxygen. The resulting
25 hypoxia (low oxygen) from chronic nutrient

enrichment can result in fish kills, odor and overall degradation of water quality." Do you agree with that statement, Mr. Mullikin?

A. Based on what I know, yes.

Q. Did you know that in February of 1998 when you started this job?

A. Yes.

Q. Even then you knew that?

A. Yes.

Q. And looking on page 6 under human health concerns it talks about the aquatic ecosystems and then goes on to say, "But there are also human health concerns associated with animal waste pollution that should be studied further." Have you learned that that is true?

A. I would agree with that.

Q. And has that been discussed by any of the officers of Peterson Farms?

A. Not in discussions that I was in with them.

Q. Look on page 21, if you would please, which I think is a description of the parts of the Animal Agriculture Reform Act. Incidentally, did Peterson support or fight this

earlier, I take it?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Were you requested to write a memo bringing people up to date?

A. At times. I don't recall if in this case I was; but at times Ms. Wilkerson would say, you know, why don't you shoot us something so that we all know where you are at and what all is going on.

Q. If we could look at the second paragraph of your memo, you say, "I personally have no opinion on whether or not the integrator or the grower owns the litter." Was this because you had heard the argument that we spoke about earlier that since the integrator owns the chicken and the feed and the bird, then it follows they really should own the litter too?

MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

A. I think the statement there was one where I didn't feel equipped, didn't feel like I knew enough about everything that was going on to have an opinion about it.

Q. Okay. And then you go on to say, "I do feel, without any doubt, that as time passes, we the integrator will be found to be liable for it

1 meeting?
2 A. The 300 pounds was an arbitrary number.
3 It was a number that, once again, not based on
4 science. It was a number that someone -- I
5 don't recall if it was the NRCS. I don't recall
6 if it was the extension service, whether it
7 was -- I think in the state of Oklahoma it was
8 mandated by legislation. But this 300 pounds
9 was a number that was set forth so that -- as I
10 state there, I believe there was only one
11 Peterson farm grower that was able to write his
12 plan because of that 300-pound threshold.
13 Q. Or apply any litter on his fields?
14 A. I would agree.
15 MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.
16 Q. Is that correct?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. And you concluded that paragraph
19 saying, "We need to continue to support anything
20 we can to help our growers find ways to dispose
21 of their litter." Do you firmly believe that?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. By the time you left, had the company
24 done anything to help its growers dispose of
25 litter?