No. 138, Original

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States



JUN 23 2008

KLM

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, *Plaintiff*, v. STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, ET AL.,

Defendants.

THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA'S JOINDER IN BRIEF OF NORTH CAROLINA REGARDING ISSUES FOR PHASE I

DEWITT F. MCCARLEY City Attorney H. MICHAEL BOYD Senior Assistant City Attorney OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY 600 East Fourth Street Charlotte, N.C. 28202 (704) 336-2254 JAMES T. BANKS H. CHRISTOPHER BARTOLOMUCCI* ADAM J. SIEGEL HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 555 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 637-5600

PARKER D. THOMSON HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 1111 Brickell Avenue Suite 1900 Miami, FL 33131

(305) 459-6500

*Counsel of Record

Counsel for the City of Charlotte

June 17, 2008

The City of Charlotte joins in the positions taken and the arguments presented in the Brief of the State of North Carolina regarding Issues for Phase I, filed June 16, 2008. Charlotte believes it is imperative that South Carolina first identify precisely the injuries it claims to have suffered and the actions in North Carolina alleged to have caused those injuries. In so doing, South Carolina faces a heavy burden of demonstrating, by clear and convincing evidence, that it has suffered injury of a serious magnitude due to depletions of the Catawba River's flows by water consumption or diversions in North Carolina. See, e.g., Connecticut v. Massachusetts, 282 U.S. 660, 669 (1931). Given the extraordinarily complex hydrology of the Catawba River Basin and the corresponding difficulty South Carolina faces in attributing its alleged injuries to water depleting activities in North Carolina, as opposed to climatic factors, reservoir operations and activities in South Carolina, Charlotte believes the schedule proposed by North Carolina is appropriate for the highly technical discovery and expert evaluation that will be required.

Respectfully submitted,

ames 1.

James T. Banks Counsel for City of Charlotte