		1		306
	304			306
		01:21:06PM	1	PROCEEDINGS
	TATES DISTRICT COURT	01:21:06PM	2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please come to order and remain
FOR THE	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	01:41:11PM	3	seated.
		01:41:14PM	4	MR. GINGOLD: Good afternoon, your Honor.
ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al.	:	01:41:16PM	5	THE COURT: Good afternoon.
Plaintiffs,	. Civil Action 96-1285	01:41:16PM	6	DR. BRADFORD CORNELL, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, PREVIOUSLY
v.	· ·	01:41:16PM	7	SWORN
DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary	. Washington, D.C. Tuesday, June 10, 2008 . 1:33 p.m.	01:41:16PM	8	DIRECT EXAMINATION
of the Interior, et al. Defendants.	. 1:33 p.m.	01:41:21PM	9	BY MR. GINGOLD (continuing):
Detendants.	•	01:41:21PM	10	Q. Dr. Cornell, you were asked to before by the Court before
	•		11	
	TRIAL - AFTERNOON SESSION ONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON	01:41:24PM		the lunch recess to explain what effect you observed
	TATES DISTRICT JUDGE	01:41:29PM	12	disbursement was with respect to 1926, I believe. Do you recall
APPEARANCES:		01:41:36PM	13	that?
For the Plaintiffs:	DENNIS GINGOLD, ESQ. Law Offices of Dennis Gingold	01:41:37PM	14	A. Yes, I do.
	607 14th Street, NW Ninth Floor	01:41:41PM	15	Q. What have you done in that regard?
	Washington, D.C. 20005 202-824-1448	01:41:42PM	16	A. I did the calculation.
	ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, ESQ.	01:41:43PM	17	Q. And what is the result of your calculation?
	WILLIAM E. DORRIS, ESQ. Kilpatrick Stockton, LLP	01:41:45PM	18	A. \$734 million in terms of the bottom line in 2008.
	1100 Peachtree Street Suite 2800	01:41:53PM	19	Q. If the observable disbursement in that document is correct?
	Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530 404-815-6450	01:41:59PM	20	A. Correct. The interest rates were a bit higher than I
	KEITH HARPER, ESQ. JUSTIN GUILDER, ESQ.	01:42:01PM	21	remembered, particularly in that 1907 period when they get above
	Kilpatrick Stockton, LLP 607 14th Street, NW	01:42:05PM	22	ten percent, so the compounding is quite important then.
	Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20005	01:42:16PM	23	MR. GINGOLD: In that regard, if this Court would
	202-585-0053	01:42:17PM	24	like, we can provide this Court and defendants with an Excel
APPEARANCES con't. on next	page.			
		01:42:21PM	25	version of what we are dealing with of Attachment A so
	line M. Sullivan, RPR cial Court Reporter			Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	305			Official Court Reporter
APPEARANCES, con't.	303			307
APPEARANCES, con't.	305	01:42:27PM	1	307 calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes
		01:42:27PM 01:42:32PM	1 2	
DAVID C. SN				calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes
DAVID C. SN DANIEL R. Kilpatrick	11 TH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP	01:42:32PM	2	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided.
DAVID C. SM DANIEL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101	01:42:32PM 01:42:39PM	2	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But
DAVID C. SM DANIEL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101	01:42:32PM 01:42:39PM 01:42:41PM	2 3 4	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you.
DAVID C. SM DANIEL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes: Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ.	01:42:32PM 01:42:39PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:51PM	2 3 4 5	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes: Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 '392 SERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ.	01:42:32PM 01:42:39PM 01:42:31PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM	2 3 4 5 6	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please.
DAVID C. SM DANIEL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes: Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAI J. CHRIST U.S. Depai	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101 (392 ERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rement of Justice eet, NW	01:42:32PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:31PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI STI U.S. Depan 1100 L Str Washingto	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Galem, North Carolina 27101 G392 JERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rtment of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005	01:42:32PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAI J. CHRI STI U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingto 202-307-0	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 1392 SERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. SSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. Timent of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:13PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depar 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tric	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Galem, North Carolina 27101 392 SERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rtment of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005 0010 MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney	01:42:32PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:12PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street ialem, North Carolina 27101 392 SERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rtment of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005 MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:53PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct?
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI STI U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingto 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Galem, North Carolina 27101 (392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rtment of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005 (010) MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch ion	01:42:33PM 01:42:34PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:13PM 01:43:13PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes.
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depail 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depail Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street ialem, North Carolina 27101 392 SERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER K	01:42:39PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:15PM 01:43:25PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean?
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAI J. CHRI ST! U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingto 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri: U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingto	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101 392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WHOM, D.C. 20005 OPHER WHOM, D.C. 20044 OPHER WHOM, D.C. 20044	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:32PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Galem, North Carolina 27101 G392 JERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rtment of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005 JOH MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch Jon, D.C. 20044 JOH D.C. 20044 JOH D.C. 20044	01:42:39PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:15PM 01:43:25PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean?
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depar 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depar Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte	IITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 1392 SERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. SCHMANSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WILLIAM OPHER O	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:32PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRISTI U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACQL Official Cour	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Galem, North Carolina 27101 (392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. RSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. rtment of Justice reet, NW on, D.C. 20005 (010) MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch (100) In Station (175) (175	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:32PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:32PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHR IST U.S. Depar 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri. U.S. Depar Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACOL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 rays EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WITH STATE STA	01:42:39PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACQL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 rays EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WITH STATE STA	01:42:32PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:32PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly.
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHR IST U.S. Depar 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri. U.S. Depar Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACOL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 rays EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WITH STATE STA	01:42:35PM 01:42:35PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:05PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what?
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHR IST U.S. Depar 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri. U.S. Depar Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACOL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 rays EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WITH STATE STA	01:42:33PM 01:42:34PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:13PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what? A. Well, I think if we really need to go to the schedule, but
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHR IST U.S. Depar 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri. U.S. Depar Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACOL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street salem, North Carolina 27101 rays EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. OPHER WITH STATE STA	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:41PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:54PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what? A. Well, I think if we really need to go to the schedule, but it's the ratio of disbursements to corrected revenue.
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAI J. CHRI STI U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingto 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Trit U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingto 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACQL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu Washington, 202-354-318	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101 392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. SSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. Timent of Justice seet, NW on, D.C. 20005 0010 MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch ion Ilin Station 175 on, D.C. 20044 1104 JELINE M. SULLIVAN, RPR t Reporter use, Room 6720 tition Avenue, NW D.C. 20001 37	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:35PM 01:43:32PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:33PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what? A. Well, I think if we really need to go to the schedule, but it's the ratio of disbursements to corrected revenue. Q. Before we go to the schedule I'd like to turn to page five
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRI ST U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingte 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingte 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACOL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu Washington, 202-354-318	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101 392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. SSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. Timent of Justice seet, NW on, D.C. 20005 0010 MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch ion Ilin Station 175 on, D.C. 20044 1104 JELINE M. SULLIVAN, RPR t Reporter use, Room 6720 tition Avenue, NW D.C. 20001 37	01:42:33PM 01:42:33PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:52PM 01:43:13PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:34PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:44PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what? A. Well, I think if we really need to go to the schedule, but it's the ratio of disbursements to corrected revenue. Q. Before we go to the schedule I'd like to turn to page five of Attachment A. Once again, you have there are no other
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAI J. CHRI STI U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingto 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Trit U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingto 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACQL Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu Washington, 202-354-318	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101 392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. SSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. Timent of Justice seet, NW on, D.C. 20005 0010 MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch ion Ilin Station 175 on, D.C. 20044 1104 JELINE M. SULLIVAN, RPR t Reporter use, Room 6720 tition Avenue, NW D.C. 20001 37	01:42:33PM 01:42:31PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:41PM 01:43:41PM 01:43:41PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what? A. Well, I think if we really need to go to the schedule, but it's the ratio of disbursements to corrected revenue. Q. Before we go to the schedule I'd like to turn to page five of Attachment A. Once again, you have there are no other disbursements calculated in that, correct?
DAVI D C. SM DANI EL R. Kilpatrick 1001 Wes Winston-S 336-607-7 For the Defendants: ROB JOHN WAF J. CHRISTI U.S. Depai 1100 L Str Washingto 202-307-0 JOHN STE Senior Tri U.S. Depai Commerci Civil Divisi Ben Frank P.O. Box 9 Washingto 202-307-1 Court Reporter: JACQU Official Cour U.S. Courtho 333 Constitu Washington, 202-354-318 Proceedings reported by mack by computer-aided transcripti	MITH, ESQ. TAYLOR, JR., ESQ. Stockton, LLP t Fourth Street Salem, North Carolina 27101 392 EERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQ. SSHAWSKY, ESQ. OPHER KOHN, ESQ. Timent of Justice seet, NW on, D.C. 20005 0010 MPLEWICZ, ESQ. al Attorney rtment of Justice al Litigation Branch ion Ilin Station 175 on, D.C. 20044 1104 JELINE M. SULLIVAN, RPR t Reporter use, Room 6720 tition Avenue, NW D.C. 20001 37	01:42:33PM 01:42:31PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:51PM 01:42:54PM 01:43:54PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:12PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:31PM 01:43:41PM 01:43:41PM 01:43:41PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM 01:43:45PM	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	calculations can be input. They would be linked and changes could be made as a better or if better data is provided. THE COURT: Well, I'm not asking for that now. But thank you. MR. GINGOLD: I'd like Plaintiffs' 41 to be back on the screen, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. I'd like you to turn to pages first page four of the Plaintiffs' 41, which is Attachment A, and I'd like you to look at the disbursement column. You have a yellow highlighted figure in the disbursement column from 1988 through 2002 on this page; is that correct? A. Yes. Q. And what does that mean? A. Well, those were the years for which the actual CPNR data was available and was used as the basis of the seventy percent calculation, but in the particular years where I have that data I plugged it in directly. Q. And the seventy percent calculation means what? A. Well, I think if we really need to go to the schedule, but it's the ratio of disbursements to corrected revenue. Q. Before we go to the schedule I'd like to turn to page five of Attachment A. Once again, you have there are no other disbursements calculated in that, correct? A. Yes.

	308		310
01:44:19PM 1	Q. Okay. Let's go to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, which is	01:49:24PM 1	Q. The slight adjustment for what?
01:44:23PM 2	Attachment C, individual Indian trust disbursement calculation.	01:49:26PM 2	A. For the fact that not all the checks that were issued were
01:45:10PM 3	Dr. Cornell, do you recognize this document?	01:49:30PM 3	cashed.
01:45:12PM 4	A. It likes like a black screen to me. I recognize this from	01:49:31PM 4	Q. So what did you specifically include then in that total
01:45:18PM 5	my home computer. There we go.	01:49:36PM 5	with regard
01:46:10PM 6	Q. Do you recognize this document, Dr. Cornell?	01:49:38PM 6	A. Well, as I recall
01:46:12PM 7	A. Yes. This is a document I prepared summarizing materials	01:49:41PM 7	Q. Let's go back to Attachment C. That's Plaintiffs' 56.
01:46:17PM 8	sent to the plaintiffs by officials at the Department of	01:49:46PM 8	A. I included the CPNR disbursements adjusted, which is Column
01:46:23PM 9	Treasury.	01:49:51PM 9	F.
01:46:23PM 10	Q. Did you review the data yourself?	01:49:51PM 10	Q. What does Column C, corrected revenues, mean?
01:46:26PM 11	A. Yes.	01:49:59PM 11	A. Column C is just directly off of my schedule. That's
01:46:27PM 12	Q. Under Column A, what is Column A?	01:50:05PM 12	Column E from Attachment A, the corrected revenues.
01:46:32PM 13	A. Those are the number of checks issued out of AALC account	01:50:10PM 13	Q. And under Column D, checks paid, that is what you just
01:46:40PM 14	number 4844, which in the cover letter from the Treasury was	01:50:16PM 14	described as you took only the data from the checks that were
01:46:47PM 15	explained to be the individual Indians monies account.	01:50:19PM 15	identified as paid or negotiated?
01:46:56PM 16	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify an	01:50:21PM 16	A. Correct. Not all the checks issued were paid. Some were
01:46:59PM 17	exhibit admitted in trial 1.5, which is DX 272. DX 272 is a	01:50:24PM 17	never cashed.
01:47:16PM 18	letter from Charles Schwann, who is document production	01:50:26PM 18	Q. I'd like to go back to DX 272 for a moment, please.
01:47:21PM 19	coordinator, Department of the Treasury, Financial Management	01:50:37PM 19	THE COURT: On this percentage of checks paid and
01:47:24PM 20	Service, to Bert Edwards, executive director, Office of his	01:50:40PM 20	cashed
01:47:31PM 21	Historical Accounting, Office of the U.S. Interior, dated	01:50:44PM 21	MR. GINGOLD: Back to Attachment C, your Honor.
01:47:33PM 22	November 4, 2003.	01:50:46PM 22	THE COURT: Well, whatever attachment you were just
01:47:33PM 23	BY MR. GINGOLD:	01:50:49PM 23	on, if hypothetically there were \$200 million worth of
01:47:35PM 24	Q. Is this the letter you're referring to?	01:50:56PM 24	disbursement checks cut and let's say two hundred thousand
01:47:36PM 25	A. Yes.	01:51:06PM 25	checks and ten percent of those checks were not cashed, what did
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	309		311
01:47:37PM 1	Q. I'd like you to turn to page two of this document, which is	01:51:14PM T	you do? Did you discount the total payment by ten percent?
01:47:43PM 2	identified as Bates 272-00032, and at the top of the page, the	01:51:17PM 2	THE WITNESS: Yes. In fact, you can see that. You
01:47:56PM 3	first sentence states, Exhibit B provides the number and amount	01:51:20PM 3	can in Column E you see the percentage of checks paid as a
01:48:01PM 4	of checks issued under symbol 4844 and captured in CPNR since	01:51:24PM 4	fraction of the percentage of checks issued.
01:48:07PM 3	the implementation of CPNR on November 6, 1986. Is that your	01:51:26PM 5	THE COURT: What do you do with the likelihood I'm
01:48:13PM 7	understanding? A. Yes, it is.	7	assuming it's a likelihood that most of the checks not cashed are the checks for twenty-five cents or a dollar-and-a-quarter
01:48:14PM 8	Q. I'd like to turn to page eighteen of this document, which	01:51:32PM 8	or two-dollars-and-a-half, that kind that aren't worth cashing.
01:48:19PM 9	is at Bates 48. It's identified as Exhibit B, and it's	01:51:40PM 9	THE WITNESS: I did not make an adjustment for check
01:48:27PM 10	identified as CPNR information for symbol 4844 by calendar year.	01:51:43PM 10	size. It's just prorated.
01:48:35PM 11	Do you recognize this information, Dr. Cornell?	01:51:44PM 11	THE COURT: All right.
01:48:37PM 12	A. Yes. That's the same information you'll find in my	01:51:47PM 12	MR. GINGOLD:
01:48:40PM 13	Attachment C.	01:51:47PM 13	Q. Did you make any determination as to whether or not that
01:48:41PM 14	Q. Okay. Under "number of records," what does that mean?	01:51:49PM 14	was a characteristic typically of checks that were not paid or
01:48:43PM 15	A. Number of checks issued.	01:51:54PM 15	cashed?
01:48:45PM 16	Q. Under "dollar amount," what does that mean?	01:51:54PM 16	A. No. There was no data on that. This is the complete data
01:48:48PM 17	A. The aggregate amount for all those checks.	01:51:57PM 17	from the Treasury.
01:48:50PM 18	Q. And what did you take from this information, including	01:51:58PM 18	Q. Now, if the checks weren't paid or cashed, do you know
01:48:54PM 19	Attachment A?	01:52:02PM 19	where the money remained?
01:48:55PM 20	A. Well, 1987 turned out to be a partial year, so I excluded	01:52:05PM 20	A. Well, presumably it would remain in the Treasury account,
01:49:01PM 21	it and then I took the rest of the information.	01:52:08PM 21	because it wasn't drawn down from it.
01:49:03PM 22	Q. So is that the reason you have the highlighted disbursement	01:52:12PM 22	Q. And the CPNR data, was that summary-level data?
01:49:12PM 23	numbers in under Column F of Attachment A on page four?	01:52:16PM 23	A. Yes.
01:49:16PM 24	A. They're drawn directly from that schedule with a slight	01:52:16PM 24	Q. So there was no checks that were provided to you that
01:49:23PM 25	adjustment.	01:52:21PM 25	supported the check disbursements, was there?
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter

	312		314
01:52:23PM 1	A. Yes.	01:55:34PM 1	A. Correct. The government calculations of the Osage receipts
01:52:24PM 2	Q. Yes, there were none?	01:55:39PM 2	doesn't begin until 1909.
01:52:26PM 3	A. Excuse me?	01:55:41PM 3	Q. Now, you do have in Column D Osage corrected, and in Osage
01:52:27PM 4	Q. There were no checks provided to you?	01:55:48PM 4	corrected on this page and on the remainder of this document
01:52:29PM 5	A. No, no. I got an output from a computer database that had	01:55:55PM 5	it's highlighted, correct?
01:52:34PM 6	been accessed by the Treasury official.	01:55:56PM 6	A. Correct.
01:52:36PM 7	Q. And if you had checks which identified the amounts, you'd	01:55:56PM 7	Q. What does that mean?
01:52:40PM 8	be able to make a determination as to whether or not the checks	01:55:58PM 8	A. It's actual data that was made available by the Osage tribe
01:52:42PM 9	had a diminimus amount, correct, that were not paid?	01:56:02PM 9	and is published on their website.
01:52:46PM 10	A. Correct.	01:56:04PM 10	Q. Is it your understanding that this is data regarding the
01:52:46PM 11	Q. But at this point in time you can't testify to that?	01:56:09PM 11	tribal money or individual Indian trust money?
01:52:50PM 12	A. That's right.	01:56:13PM 12	A. Individual Indian trust money data, but provided by the
01:52:50PM 13	Q. Now, there was data in the CPNR database for 1987, wasn't	01:56:19PM 13	Osage tribe.
01:53:02PM 14	there?	01:56:20PM 14	Q. Now, in 1909, which is the first year the government
01:53:03PM 15	A. Yes.	01:56:26PM 15	provided seems to have provide the Osage data as identified
01:53:03PM 16	Q. Did you use it?	01:56:34PM 16	on Attachment A, Column C, you had Osage corrected with a point
01:53:04PM 17	A. No. After looking at it, it turned out to be a partial	01:56:46PM 17	seventy statement, correct?
01:53:08PM 18	year, and rather than trying to annualize incomplete data, since	01:56:46PM 18	A. Correct.
01:53:15PM 19	we had fifteen years of good data, I just used the full annual	01:56:47PM 19	Q. And what does that mean?
01:53:20PM 20	data.	01:56:48PM 20	A. That means the Osage tribe reported \$700,000 worth of IIM
01:53:20PM 21	Q. Is that appropriate for you to do when you're trying to	01:56:58PM 21	revenue that year.
01:53:30PM 22	determine what a reasonable or reasonable approximation of the	01:56:59PM 22	Q. And each one of the items in Column D reflects does it
01:53:36PM 23	check disbursements or other data?	01:57:05PM 23	reflect the reporting of information on IIM Osage data from the
01:53:41PM 24	A. This is the first time I've ever dealt with this type of	01:57:12PM 24	tribe?
01:53:44PM 25	check disbursement data, but when you have a large unambiguous	01:57:12PM 25	A. Yes.
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
			· ·
1	313	1	315
01:53:47PM 1	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more	01:57:12PM 1	315 Q. And let's go to page two.
01:53:51PM 2	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable.	01:57:16PM 2	315 Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data?	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3	315 Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work,
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable,	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4	315 Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:27PM 5	315 Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:05PM 6	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it.	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6	315 Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:05PM 5 01:54:05PM 6	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:27PM 5 01:57:20PM 6	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why.
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:05PM 6 01:54:05PM 7	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:38PM 7	315 Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 6 01:54:08PM 7 01:54:17PM 8	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:34PM 8	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor.
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:03PM 8 01:54:23PM 9	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct?	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:44PM 9	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:03PM 5 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes.	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:38PM 7 01:57:38PM 8 01:57:46PM 9 01:57:53PM 10	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues.
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:05PM 6 01:54:05PM 7 01:54:17PM 8 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:25PM 10 01:54:25PM 11	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:44PM 10 01:57:53PM 10	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right.
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:05PM 5 01:54:05PM 6 01:54:05PM 7 01:54:27PM 8 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:25PM 10 01:54:25PM 11 01:54:31PM 12	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:45PM 10 01:57:55PM 11 01:57:55PM 12	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:25PM 11 01:54:35PM 12 01:54:35PM 13	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here?	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:46PM 9 01:57:53PM 10 01:57:55PM 11 01:57:55PM 12 01:58:02PM 13	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D,
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 6 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:17PM 8 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:25PM 10 01:54:25PM 11 01:54:31PM 12 01:54:35PM 13 01:54:37PM 14	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:30PM 8 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:34PM 10 01:57:55PM 11 01:57:55PM 12 01:58:02PM 13 01:58:02PM 13	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 6 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:17PM 8 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:25PM 11 01:54:31PM 12 01:54:34PM 13 01:54:37PM 14 01:54:37PM 15	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:44PM 10 01:57:53PM 11 01:57:53PM 12 01:58:03PM 13 01:58:03PM 14 01:58:03PM 14	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:03PM 9 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:33PM 12 01:54:34PM 13 01:54:34PM 14 01:54:34PM 15	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it.	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:44PM 9 01:57:46PM 10 01:57:55PM 11 01:57:55PM 12 01:58:15PM 14 01:58:15PM 15	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:03PM 5 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:03PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:34PM 12 01:54:34PM 13 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 15	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:36PM 10 01:57:36PM 11 01:57:36PM 12 01:58:02PM 13 01:58:02PM 14 01:58:15PM 15	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:05PM 5 01:54:05PM 6 01:54:05PM 7 01:54:17PM 8 01:54:25PM 10 01:54:25PM 11 01:54:31PM 12 01:54:34PM 13 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:45PM 16 01:54:45PM 16 01:54:45PM 17 01:54:55PM 18	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct?	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:34PM 8 01:57:34PM 10 01:57:53PM 11 01:57:53PM 12 01:58:03PM 14 01:58:03PM 14 01:58:15PM 15 01:58:24PM 16	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:03PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:34PM 12 01:54:35PM 13 01:54:35PM 15 01:54:35PM 16 01:54:35PM 16 01:54:35PM 17 01:54:35PM 18 01:54:35PM 19 01:54:55PM 20 01:54:57PM 20 01:55:12PM 21	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct.	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:34PM 9 01:57:36PM 10 01:57:36PM 11 01:57:36PM 12 01:58:02PM 13 01:58:15PM 16 01:58:15PM 16 01:58:15PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:23PM 20 01:58:33PM 20 01:58:33PM 20	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data.
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:23PM 12 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 16 01:54:34PM 17 01:54:35PM 18 01:54:55PM 18 01:54:55PM 19 01:54:57PM 20	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct. Q. Let's talk about the Osage issue Attachment A. Under	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:23PM 7 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:44PM 9 01:57:53PM 10 01:57:53PM 11 01:57:55PM 12 01:58:15PM 15 01:58:15PM 15 01:58:15PM 15 01:58:15PM 15 01:58:24PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:24PM 19 01:58:24PM 19	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data. THE COURT: Thank you. That is succinct and
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:23PM 12 01:54:33PM 14 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:35PM 16 01:54:35PM 17 01:54:35PM 18 01:54:55PM 19 01:54:55PM 20 01:55:15PM 21	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct. Q. Let's talk about the Osage issue Attachment A. Under Column C you have Osage government calculated. Do you see that?	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:46PM 9 01:57:53PM 10 01:57:53PM 11 01:57:56PM 12 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:24PM 19 01:58:24PM 19 01:58:35PM 20 01:58:35PM 21	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data. THE COURT: Thank you. That is succinct and understandable.
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:03PM 5 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:33PM 12 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:35PM 16 01:54:35PM 17 01:54:35PM 18 01:54:55PM 20 01:55:15PM 20 01:55:15PM 21 01:55:15PM 22 01:55:15PM 22 01:55:15PM 23 01:55:25PM 24	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct. Q. Let's talk about the Osage issue Attachment A. Under Column C you have Osage government calculated. Do you see that? A. I see that.	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:34PM 9 01:57:36PM 10 01:57:36PM 11 01:57:36PM 12 01:58:02PM 13 01:58:02PM 14 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 16 01:58:12PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:23PM 20 01:58:35PM 21 01:58:35PM 21 01:58:35PM 22 01:58:35PM 22 01:58:35PM 22	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data. THE COURT: Thank you. That is succinct and understandable. BY MR. GINGOLD:
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:00PM 5 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:00PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:23PM 12 01:54:33PM 14 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:35PM 16 01:54:35PM 17 01:54:35PM 18 01:54:55PM 19 01:54:55PM 20 01:55:15PM 21	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct. Q. Let's talk about the Osage issue Attachment A. Under Column C you have Osage government calculated. Do you see that? A. I see that. Q. Let's go to page one of Attachment A. You have Osage	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 5 01:57:30PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:44PM 8 01:57:46PM 9 01:57:53PM 10 01:57:53PM 11 01:57:56PM 12 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:24PM 19 01:58:24PM 19 01:58:35PM 20 01:58:35PM 21	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data. THE COURT: Thank you. That is succinct and understandable. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. But at least through 1908 the government didn't provide
01:53:51PM 2 01:53:53PM 3 01:53:55PM 4 01:54:03PM 5 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:03PM 7 01:54:23PM 9 01:54:23PM 10 01:54:23PM 11 01:54:33PM 12 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:34PM 15 01:54:35PM 16 01:54:35PM 17 01:54:35PM 18 01:54:55PM 20 01:55:15PM 20 01:55:15PM 21 01:55:15PM 22 01:55:15PM 22 01:55:15PM 23 01:55:25PM 24	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct. Q. Let's talk about the Osage issue Attachment A. Under Column C you have Osage government calculated. Do you see that? A. I see that. Q. Let's go to page one of Attachment A. You have Osage government calculated but you have nothing highlighted to 1908;	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:34PM 9 01:57:36PM 10 01:57:36PM 11 01:57:36PM 12 01:58:02PM 13 01:58:02PM 14 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 16 01:58:12PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:23PM 20 01:58:35PM 21 01:58:35PM 21 01:58:35PM 22 01:58:35PM 22 01:58:35PM 22	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data. THE COURT: Thank you. That is succinct and understandable. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. But at least through 1908 the government didn't provide data; is that correct?
015351PM 2 015353PM 4 015405PM 5 015405PM 6 015405PM 7 015417PM 8 015425PM 10 015425PM 11 015435PM 12 015435PM 15 015435PM 15 015435PM 16 015445PM 17 015435PM 18 015455PM 18 015455PM 19 015455PM 20 015615PM 20 015515PM 21 015515PM 22 015515PM 22 015515PM 22 015515PM 23 015515PM 23 015515PM 23 015515PM 23 015515PM 23	sample, I think it's reason to not pollute it with one more observation, which is not comparable. Q. Is that because it's incomplete data? A. Yeah. Because it's incomplete, it's not exact comparable, and actually if I included it it would reduce my disbursement rate, but I don't think it would be appropriate to include it. Q. So from the period of time 1988 to 2002, you had actual disbursements data from the trust, from the individual named trust by check, correct? A. Yes. Q. And is that the basis for your extrapolation on the disbursement total for the remainder of the years that we're dealing with here? A. Yes. I took this data as being based on conversation with counsel and what I had been able to find as being the most reliable data and extrapolated it. Q. Again, if you had data that was proven to be reliable, you could easily use that in your model, correct? A. Correct. Q. Let's talk about the Osage issue Attachment A. Under Column C you have Osage government calculated. Do you see that? A. I see that. Q. Let's go to page one of Attachment A. You have Osage government calculated but you have nothing highlighted to 1908; is that correct? Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter	01:57:16PM 2 01:57:20PM 3 01:57:23PM 4 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:23PM 6 01:57:30PM 7 01:57:34PM 9 01:57:36PM 10 01:57:36PM 11 01:57:36PM 12 01:58:02PM 13 01:58:02PM 14 01:58:12PM 15 01:58:12PM 16 01:58:12PM 17 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:24PM 18 01:58:23PM 20 01:58:35PM 21 01:58:35PM 21 01:58:35PM 22 01:58:35PM 22 01:58:35PM 22	Q. And let's go to page two. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, can I ask you to back up for a minute and explain to me again how these three columns work, because I'm trying to figure out what "government corrected" and "Osage corrected" means, and it seems to me that what you're doing, at least what this chart does, is it adds Column B and Column D and subtracts Column C, but I don't know why. THE WITNESS: Here's the explanation, your Honor. Included in Column B is the government Osage data, so it's in there in the revenues. THE COURT: All right. THE WITNESS: Plaintiffs believe and have argued to me that the data provided by the Osage tribe, which is in Column D, is more accurate and complete, so what I have done is I've started with the government number, taken out their Osage component and replaced it with the tribal component. That's why I call Column E corrected revenue, so the government number that's in B is taken out and then the Osage is put back in using what plaintiffs believe is more accurate Osage data. THE COURT: Thank you. That is succinct and understandable. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. But at least through 1908 the government didn't provide data; is that correct? A. There are some very early years. If we go up to the top Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter

	316		318
1		02:02:17PM 1	Indian money would be the last money you'd credit?
01:58:49PM I	I'll explain that too.	-	
3	Q. Page one, please.	2	THE WITNESS: Well, I'm treating it as the mariginal
4	A. What the government did not provide Osage data explicitly that I could then take out, so what I did was I noted in all the		money, that everything else is held the same and the government either has or does not have the Indian monies.
01:59:01PM 4	years where there was data, 1909 to the present, the Osage	02:02:28PM 4	THE COURT: Okay.
01:59:12PM 6	government was 41.4 percent I think it is of the Osage	02:02:32PM 6	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, plaintiffs would like to
01:59:12PM 7	corrected, so I plugged in 41.4 percent of the corrected as an	02:02:34PM 7	identify Exhibit 59. It's identified as Treasury Debt,
01:59:10PM 8	estimate of the Osage government and then did the same	02:02:44PM 8	Historical Debt Outstanding Annual, 2000 to 2007.
01:59:28PM 9	technique, took it out and replaced it.	02:02:44FM 9	THE COURT: That's too depressing. I don't want to
01:59:31PM 10	Q. So you didn't double count the revenue, correct?	02:02:50PM 10	see that exhibit.
01:59:33PM 11	A. I did not double count the Osage.	02:02:54PM 11	THE WITNESS: It's more depressing when you divide by
01:59:36PM 12	Q. Is that a reasonable approach to take when you have data	02:02:56PM 12	the working population.
01:59:41PM 13	that is missing, to be able to plug in the number based on the	02:03:01PM 13	MR. GINGOLD: We won't ask any questions about that,
01:59:45PM 14	percentage that you observed for the other information?	02:03:03PM 14	your Honor.
01:59:48PM 15	A. Yes, I think that is.	02:03:04PM 15	Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification
01:59:49PM 16	Q. With respect to Attachment A, you identified a column under	02:03:05PM 16	Exhibit 58. Exhibit 58 is entitled IIM Banking Policy, prepared
02:00:08PM 17	G that's labeled nominal benefit to the government. What does	02:03:23PM 17	by Terence Kehoe, Morgan, Angel & Associates. This too was
02:00:14PM 18	that mean?	02:03:29PM 18	produced in trial 1.5 by the government.
02:00:14PM 19	A. That's just that year's revenues minus disbursements so	02:03:29PM 19	(Plaintiffs' Exhibit No. 58 was marked for
02:00:19PM 20	that you can see it and don't have to calculate it.	02:03:29PM 20	identification at about 2:03 p.m.)
02:00:22PM 21	Q. Does that include interest?	02:03:29PM 21	BY MR. GINGOLD:
02:00:23PM 22	A. No.	02:03:32PM 22	Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to the second page of
02:00:24PM 23	Q. And with regard to Column I, which is identified as accrued	02:03:35PM 23	this excerpted exhibit, which is Bates number it looks like
02:00:32PM 24	benefit annual, what does that mean?	02:03:45PM 24	D1100034. The Court had asked you questions at the beginning of
02:00:36PM 25	A. That is the interest earned on the balance at the beginning	02:03:54PM 25	your testimony about funds held on deposit in banks. Do you
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	317		319
02:00:40PM 1	317 of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the	02:03:58PM 1	recall that?
02:00:40PM 1 02:00:44PM 2		02:03:58PM 1	
_	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the		recall that?
02:00:44PM 2	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at	02:03:59PM 2	recall that? A. I think so.
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 3	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year.	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3	recall that? A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller?
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 3 02:00:49PM 4	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J?	02:03:59PM	recall that? A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there.
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 3 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:58PM 5 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7	recall that? A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 3 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:55PM 5 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please.	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8	recall that? A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government?
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:58PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9	recall that? A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 3 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:58PM 5 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:19PM 9 02:01:21PM 10	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower?	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:35PM 10	recall that? A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 3 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:58PM 5 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 9 02:01:24PM 10	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:35PM 10 02:04:35PM 11	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks.
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:01:08PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:19PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 11	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:35PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:40PM 12	A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred?
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:58PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:19PM 9 02:01:21PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:27PM 12	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:43PM 12 02:04:43PM 13	A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:55PM 5 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:30PM 13 02:01:34PM 14	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:35PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:45PM 12 02:04:45PM 13 02:04:45PM 14	A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer.
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:55PM 5 02:01:05PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:14PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 13 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:34PM 14	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few.	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:35PM 12 02:04:45PM 13 02:04:45PM 14 02:04:45PM 15	A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD:
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:55PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:13PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 15	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:35PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:40PM 12 02:04:45PM 13 02:04:45PM 15 02:04:45PM 15	A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:58PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:19PM 9 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 13 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:43PM 16	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years?	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:01PM 5 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:33PM 11 02:04:45PM 12 02:04:45PM 13 02:04:45PM 14 02:04:45PM 15 02:04:45PM 16 02:04:45PM 16	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 13 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:45PM 16 02:01:45PM 17	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 10 02:04:38PM 11 02:04:38PM 11 02:04:46PM 13 02:04:48PM 15 02:04:48PM 16 02:04:48PM 16 02:04:48PM 17 02:04:48PM 18	A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks?
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 9 02:01:21PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:45PM 17 02:01:45PM 18	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:11PM 6 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:33PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:45PM 13 02:04:45PM 14 02:04:45PM 15 02:04:45PM 16 02:04:52PM 17 02:04:52PM 18	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:58PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:30PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:43PM 17 02:01:48PM 17 02:01:48PM 18 02:01:48PM 19 02:01:48PM 19	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:38PM 11 02:04:40PM 12 02:04:49PM 14 02:04:48PM 15 02:04:48PM 16 02:04:52PM 17 02:04:55PM 18	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:19PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:30PM 13 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:45PM 17 02:01:45PM 18 02:01:45PM 19	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could save	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:01PM 5 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:45PM 15 02:04:45PM 15 02:04:45PM 16 02:04:55PM 17 02:04:55PM 18 02:04:55PM 19 02:04:55PM 20 02:05:03PM 21	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:58PM 7 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:30PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:43PM 17 02:01:48PM 17 02:01:48PM 18 02:01:48PM 19 02:01:48PM 19	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could use it in	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:38PM 11 02:04:40PM 12 02:04:49PM 14 02:04:48PM 15 02:04:48PM 16 02:04:52PM 17 02:04:55PM 18	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed entirely to individual Indians, there would be no benefit
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:01:09PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 13 02:01:34PM 14 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:45PM 16 02:01:45PM 17 02:01:45PM 18 02:01:45PM 19 02:01:56PM 20 02:01:56PM 21	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could save interest if someone gave me some money and I could use it in lieu of borrowing by paying down that borrowing further.	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:33PM 10 02:04:35PM 11 02:04:40PM 12 02:04:46PM 15 02:04:46PM 15 02:04:46PM 16 02:04:45PM 17 02:04:45PM 18 02:04:55PM 19 02:04:55PM 19 02:04:55PM 20 02:05:06PM 21 02:05:06PM 23	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed entirely to individual Indians, there would be no benefit conferred on the government. If they were held there and
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:48PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:00:58PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:11PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:34PM 15 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:45PM 17 02:01:45PM 17 02:01:45PM 18 02:01:45PM 19 02:01:45PM 20 02:01:58PM 21 02:01:58PM 21 02:01:58PM 21	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could use it in	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:11PM 5 02:04:19PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:39PM 10 02:04:39PM 11 02:04:39PM 11 02:04:39PM 15 02:04:48PM 15 02:04:48PM 16 02:04:54PM 18 02:04:54PM 18 02:04:54PM 18 02:04:54PM 19 02:04:54PM 20 02:04:54PM 20 02:04:54PM 20 02:04:54PM 20 02:04:54PM 20	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed entirely to individual Indians, there would be no benefit
02:00:48PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:58PM 5 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:10PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:19PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:30PM 15 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:43PM 17 02:01:45PM 18 02:01:45PM 19 02:01:45PM 20	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could save interest if someone gave me some money and I could use it in lieu of borrowing by paying down that borrowing further. THE COURT: But by your theory, unless the national	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:33PM 11 02:04:46PM 12 02:04:46PM 14 02:04:46PM 15 02:04:46PM 16 02:04:59PM 10 02:04:59PM 20 02:05:05PM 21 02:05:05PM 22 02:05:05PM 24	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed entirely to individual Indians, there would be no benefit conferred on the government. If they were held there and allowed to accumulate and eventually used for some government-
02:00:44PM 2 02:00:48PM 4 02:00:55PM 5 02:00:48PM 6 02:01:03PM 6 02:01:16PM 7 02:01:11PM 8 02:01:49PM 10 02:01:24PM 11 02:01:24PM 12 02:01:30PM 15 02:01:43PM 15 02:01:43PM 16 02:01:43PM 17 02:01:45PM 18 02:01:45PM 19 02:01:51PM 20 02:01:51PM 20 02:01:51PM 20 02:01:54PM 21 02:02:05PM 21 02:02:05PM 22 02:02:05PM 24	of the year, and I shouldn't say earned. It is really the interest saved on the balance at the beginning of the year at the government bond rate for that year. Q. And Column J, what is Column J? A. Column J is the accumulated benefit, which is the benefit for that year plus the interest saving, plus the cummulated benefits from previous years. Q. If you can turn to page five, please. THE COURT: Are there any of these years in which the government was not a net borrower? THE WITNESS: It was always a debter so it always was in debt, but there were years where in that particular year they were able to pay down part of the debt so they were not a net borrower. I think there's a couple in the '20s and 1955, and not many, but there are a few. THE COURT: And should we be including interest for those years? THE WITNESS: Yes, because if the government in order to not include the interest saved, the government would have to not be a net borrower, so even if I'm paying down my mortgage, as long as I have a mortgage outstanding I could save interest if someone gave me some money and I could use it in lieu of borrowing by paying down that borrowing further. THE COURT: But by your theory, unless the national debt got down below the accumulated amount, in other words, the	02:03:59PM 2 02:04:01PM 3 02:04:05PM 4 02:04:15PM 6 02:04:15PM 7 02:04:24PM 8 02:04:33PM 9 02:04:33PM 11 02:04:46PM 12 02:04:46PM 14 02:04:46PM 15 02:04:46PM 16 02:04:59PM 10 02:04:59PM 20 02:05:05PM 21 02:05:05PM 22 02:05:05PM 24	 A. I think so. Q. Do you recall listening to the testimony of Mr. Miller? A. Yes. There was extensive discussion of it there. Q. In your view or if funds are held in banks, is there still a benefit if individual Indian trust funds are held in commercial banks and not directly in the general Treasury, is it your view there is a benefit conferred on the government? MR. KIRSCHMAN: Objection; lack of foundation. He's testifying based on his understanding about legal rights and money held in banks. MR. GINGOLD: Is there an economic benefit conferred? THE COURT: I'll allow it. I can sort that out. I'll hear his answer. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you believe there would be an economic or financial benefit conferred on the government if trust funds are held in commercial banks? A. Well, the critical question from an economic standpoint is not where the monies are held, but how they're used. If the monies were put into bank accounts and held there and disbursed entirely to individual Indians, there would be no benefit conferred on the government. If they were held there and allowed to accumulate and eventually used for some government-related expenditure or returned to the Treasury, there would be

		1	
	320		322
02:05:20PM 1	a benefit to the government. And I should add one thing, that	02:08:07PM 1	inputs. As a financial economist I believe that the methodology
02:05:23PM 2	at that time banks gave free services to parties holding funds,	02:08:12PM 2	used in Attachment A is the correct approach for computing
02:05:31PM 3	so the Treasury would probably get free banking services because	02:08:18PM 3	benefits conferred on the government. As to the precise numbers
02:05:35PM 4	of the Indian monies held there, which would be a benefit.	02:08:24PM 4	to input into it, I've used the best approximation that I could
02:05:38PM 5	Q. That is what is	02:08:29PM 5	come up with having worked on this matter for a couple of
02:05:40PM 6	THE COURT: What's that, a dollar a month? I mean,	02:08:32PM 6	months, but I was also told that much of the input would come
02:05:42PM 7	what is it?	02:08:36PM 7	from the government's efforts to, for example, prove
02:05:44PM 8	BY MR. GINGOLD:	02:08:40PM 8	disbursements, and I indicated that if the inputs were improved,
02:05:44PM 9	Q. Is that what is referred to as compensating balances in	02:08:45PM 9	then I could input that into the model and get an improved
02:05:48PM 10	banking parlance?	02:08:51PM 10	estimate of the bottom line.
02:05:50PM 11	A. What the government would be getting there is the clearing	02:08:52PM 11	Q. But in your model, as you stated based on CPNR data, you
02:05:53PM 12	services and the accounting services and so forth.	02:08:58PM 12	used the seventy percent disbursement for the years that were
02:05:56PM 13	THE COURT: Are you putting in a claim for curing	02:09:03PM 13	actually provided in summary form in the CPNR database, correct?
02:05:59PM 14	services and accounting services?	02:09:08PM 14	A. Well, in the years where the CPNR data were provided I used
02:06:01PM 15	MR. GINGOLD: Not yet, your Honor.	02:09:14PM 15	that actual data, and in all the other years I used seventy
02:06:08PM 16	BY MR. GINGOLD:	02:09:17PM 16	percent, which was the average disbursement rate from the CPNR
02:06:08PM 17	Q. Now, if funds were removed from the banks and then pulled	02:09:20PM 17	data.
02:06:12PM 18	back into the Treasury, it's a very direct issue, correct?	02:09:21PM 18	Q. So just as the disbursements can, the percentage of
02:06:15PM 19	A. That would be a direct benefit to the government, or if the	02:09:24PM 19	disbursements could increase with the additional data that's
02:06:19PM 20	funds were disbursed from the banks to pay for government	02:09:28PM 20	considered a benefit, it is also possible that the seventy
02:06:23PM 21	expenditures, such as to finance the Bureau of Indian Affairs,	02:09:33РМ 21	percent number could decrease if, for example, checks were not
02:06:26PM 22	for example.	02:09:37PM 22	identified to support a percentage?
02:06:27PM 23	Q. I'd like to point your attention to the highlighted section	02:09:39PM 23	A. That would be possibility.
02:06:30PM 24	of this exhibit, which says, In August 1934 acting centers	02:09:40PM 24	Q. But we don't know, do we?
02:06:35PM 25	informed the controller general that, quote, except in five or	02:09:41PM 25	A. I don't know.
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
4	321	1	323
02:06:39PM 1	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and	02:09:42PM 1	Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your
02:06:42PM 2	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by	02:09:46PM 2	Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3	Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before?	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4	Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes.	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:10PM 5	Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:10PM 5 02:10:15PM 6	Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct?
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:55PM 6 02:06:55PM 7	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:10PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:55PM 6 02:06:55PM 7 02:07:03PM 8	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct?	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:16PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:55PM 6 02:06:55PM 7	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading.	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:10PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8 02:10:19PM 9	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred.
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:59PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 9	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct?	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:16PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:55PM 6 02:06:55PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 9 02:07:03PM 10	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:16PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8 02:10:23PM 9 02:10:28PM 10	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred.
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:48PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:59PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 9 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:03PM 11	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay."	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:16PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8 02:10:23PM 9 02:10:23PM 10	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:45PM 4 02:06:52PM 5 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:05PM 9 02:07:05PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay.	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:31PM 11	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct?
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 9 02:07:05PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:12PM 13	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea,	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:23PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:36PM 11 02:10:36PM 12 02:10:36PM 12	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:03PM 11 02:07:03PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:12PM 13	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky.	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:16PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8 02:10:23PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:31PM 11 02:10:36PM 12 02:10:41PM 13 02:10:43PM 14	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line.
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:24PM 15	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8 02:10:23PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:36PM 11 02:10:36PM 12 02:10:43PM 13 02:10:43PM 14 02:10:48PM 15	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor.
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 9 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:24PM 15	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence.	02:09:48PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:29PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:31PM 11 02:10:34PM 12 02:10:48PM 13 02:10:48PM 14 02:10:48PM 15	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky?
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:06:59PM 7 02:07:03PM 9 02:07:05PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:23PM 16 02:07:23PM 17	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:23PM 11 02:10:36PM 12 02:10:41PM 13 02:10:43PM 14 02:10:45PM 15 02:10:51PM 16	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:46PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:59PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:03PM 11 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:23PM 16 02:07:23PM 17 02:07:33PM 18	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on.	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:16PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 10 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:34PM 11 02:10:34PM 12 02:10:43PM 14 02:10:43PM 15 02:10:51PM 16 02:10:51PM 17 02:10:51PM 17	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:45PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:59PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:05PM 9 02:07:05PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:23PM 16 02:07:23PM 17 02:07:33PM 18 02:07:33PM 19	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD:	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 10 02:10:34PM 11 02:10:34PM 12 02:10:34PM 13 02:10:34PM 15 02:10:35PM 16 02:10:35PM 17 02:10:35PM 18 02:10:36PM 18	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:23PM 16 02:07:33PM 18 02:07:33PM 18 02:07:33PM 19 02:07:33PM 20	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Your Attachment A is your best approach to providing an	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:36PM 10 02:10:26PM 11 02:10:36PM 12 02:10:41PM 13 02:10:48PM 15 02:10:48PM 15 02:10:51PM 16 02:10:56PM 17 02:10:56PM 18	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 7 02:06:53PM 7 02:06:53PM 9 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:16PM 12 02:07:12PM 13 02:07:22PM 14 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:23PM 16 02:07:23PM 17 02:07:33PM 18 02:07:33PM 19 02:07:38PM 20 02:07:38PM 21	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Your Attachment A is your best approach to providing an approximation of the benefit conferred on the government, isn't	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 8 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:23PM 11 02:10:36PM 12 02:10:41PM 13 02:10:43PM 14 02:10:43PM 15 02:10:51PM 16 02:10:51PM 17 02:10:56PM 18 02:10:56PM 19 02:11:18PM 20 02:11:18PM 20	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a number of questions this afternoon.
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 9 02:07:05PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:10PM 15 02:07:22PM 15 02:07:22PM 16 02:07:23PM 17 02:07:33PM 18 02:07:33PM 19 02:07:33PM 20 02:07:34PM 21 02:07:34PM 21 02:07:34PM 21 02:07:34PM 22 02:07:54PM 23 02:07:54PM 23	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Your Attachment A is your best approach to providing an approximation of the benefit conferred on the government, isn't it?	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:15PM 10 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:33PM 11 02:10:34PM 12 02:10:34PM 15 02:10:48PM 15 02:10:54PM 16 02:10:54PM 17 02:10:56PM 18 02:10:56PM 19 02:11:18PM 20 02:11:18PM 20	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a number of questions this afternoon. You've testified a number of times before, correct.
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:48PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:03PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:24PM 15 02:07:24PM 15 02:07:28PM 17 02:07:38PM 19 02:07:38PM 19 02:07:38PM 20 02:07:54PM 21 02:07:54PM 22 02:07:54PM 23	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Your Attachment A is your best approach to providing an approximation of the benefit conferred on the government, isn't it? A. I want to say two things in that regard with respect to	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:23PM 9 02:10:23PM 10 02:10:31PM 11 02:10:34PM 12 02:10:45PM 15 02:10:45PM 15 02:10:54PM 16 02:10:54PM 17 02:10:56PM 17 02:10:56PM 18 02:10:56PM 19 02:11:18PM 20 02:11:24PM 21	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a number of questions this afternoon. You've testified a number of times before, correct. A. Yes.
02.06.42PM 2 02.06.42PM 3 02.06.52PM 4 02.06.53PM 5 02.06.53PM 6 02.06.53PM 7 02.07.03PM 8 02.07.03PM 10 02.07.05PM 11 02.07.10PM 12 02.07.10PM 15 02.07.22PM 15 02.07.23PM 15 02.07.23PM 16 02.07.23PM 17 02.07.33PM 19 02.07.33PM 19 02.07.33PM 20 02.07.34PM 21 02.07.34PM 21 02.07.34PM 21	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Your Attachment A is your best approach to providing an approximation of the benefit conferred on the government, isn't it? A. I want to say two things in that regard with respect to Attachment A because it really has two aspects. One is it's a	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:26PM 10 02:10:26PM 11 02:10:26PM 11 02:10:26PM 15 02:10:26PM 17 02:10:36PM 15 02:10:36PM 17 02:10:36PM 18 02:10:36PM 19 02:10:36PM 19 02:10:36PM 20 02:11:24PM 21 02:11:24PM 23 02:11:24PM 23	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a number of questions this afternoon. You've testified a number of times before, correct. A. Yes. Q. So you know how the process works. If I ask you anything
02:06:42PM 2 02:06:42PM 3 02:06:52PM 4 02:06:53PM 5 02:06:53PM 6 02:06:53PM 7 02:07:03PM 8 02:07:03PM 10 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:05PM 11 02:07:10PM 12 02:07:10PM 15 02:07:22PM 16 02:07:22PM 17 02:07:33PM 18 02:07:33PM 19 02:07:33PM 19 02:07:33PM 20 02:07:34PM 21 02:07:34PM 21 02:07:34PM 22 02:07:34PM 23 02:07:34PM 23	six instances all IIM checking accounts had been closed and practically all disbursements of such funds are now made by check on the treasurer of the United States. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes. Q. Yes. Q. So if all the accounts were closed and the funds were disbursed to the Treasury, it's just a standard benefit conferred analysis, correct? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection; leading. THE COURT: I thought your objection was going to be "hearsay." MR. WARSHAWSKY: I'll object, hearsay. THE COURT: Sustained. Sustained. I mean, good idea, Mr. Warshawsky. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government filed this report in this Court and it was admitted into evidence. THE COURT: Look, this is almost a collateral issue as far as this witness is concerned. Let's move on. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Your Attachment A is your best approach to providing an approximation of the benefit conferred on the government, isn't it? A. I want to say two things in that regard with respect to Attachment A because it really has two aspects. One is it's a financial economic model, and two is it relies on specific Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter	02:09:46PM 2 02:09:54PM 3 02:10:05PM 4 02:10:15PM 5 02:10:15PM 6 02:10:15PM 7 02:10:26PM 10 02:10:26PM 11 02:10:26PM 11 02:10:26PM 15 02:10:26PM 17 02:10:36PM 15 02:10:36PM 17 02:10:36PM 18 02:10:36PM 19 02:10:36PM 19 02:10:36PM 20 02:11:24PM 21 02:11:24PM 23 02:11:24PM 23	 Q. So based on the information you have, and based on your analysis, subject to the modification that was raised based on the \$734.33 million adjustment for 1926 I believe, you believe your model accurately states the benefit conferred on the government through the use of individual Indian trust funds; is that correct? A. I believe the model is appropriate, and given the assumptions that I 've testified to today, it takes those assumptions and translates them into a benefit conferred. Q. And to the extent that there's evidence to support the \$734.33 million or more, that would also be included in your model and the results would be adjusted; is that correct? A. Yes. If you make the change in the model the spreadsheet would automatically adjust the bottom line. MR. GINGOLD: No further questions, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky? CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Good afternoon, Professor Cornell. My name is John Warshawsky from the Justice Department. I am going to ask you a number of questions this afternoon. You've testified a number of times before, correct. A. Yes. Q. So you know how the process works. If I ask you anything and you'd like it clarified or rephrased, please let me know.

	324		326
02:11:31PM 1	I'll be happy to work with you, okay?	02:14:12PM 1	where you may have gotten information for your analysis.
02:11:32PM 2	A. Okay.	02:14:16PM 2	A. Well, two sources. To some extent the plaintiffs'
02:11:32PM 3	Q. All right. I want to follow-up on the last exchange that	02:14:22PM 3	attorneys directly, but primarily via my staff who corresponded
02:11:35PM 4	you just had with Mr. Gingold. You were talking about the	02:14:28PM 4	extensively with plaintiffs' attorneys and documents float back
02:11:40PM 5	methodology in your model which you've represented is the proper	02:14:31PM 5	and forth, but most of those documents were sent to CRA opened
02:11:44PM 6	methodology, but you're also talking about making some	02:14:35PM 6	and examined by the staff and then presented to me.
02:11:48PM 7	adjustments based on government data?	02:14:38PM 7	Q. Did you personally ask to speak with anyone besides
02:11:50PM 8	A. Correct.	02:14:44PM 8	Plaintiffs' counsel, for example?
02:11:51PM 9	Q. So to be sure we understand what you're testifying to	02:14:45PM 9	A. I spoke with some of the other experts who have testified
02:11:56PM 10	today, it's your opinion that the methodology is correct, right?	02:14:51PM 10	today, Mr. Miller, Dr. Miller, Mr. Laykoc. That's about all I
02:12:01PM 11	A. Yes.	02:15:02PM 11	recall.
02:12:02PM 12	Q. But you're not here today to tell the judge that this is	02:15:02PM 12	Q. Professor Cornell, what document did you review in the
02:12:06PM 13	actually the precise measure of the government's benefit from	02:15:05PM 13	context in preparing your opinion?
02:12:10PM 14	the government's alleged use of funds that couldn't be explained	02:15:07PM 14	A. Well, a lot. They were accumulated into more than a dozen
02:12:15PM 15	from the accounting?	02:15:15PM 15	large binders. They were primarily historical documents,
02:12:16PM 16	A. Well, I think that requires work further than I've done.	02:15:23PM 16	reports, government documents, things of the nature that have
02:12:26PM 17	For example, one of the first things I asked was to hear the	02:15:28PM 17	been introduced as exhibits to Attachment A.
02:12:29PM 18	government's evidence regarding disbursements, and to the extent	02:15:32PM 18	Q. And how did you obtain these documents?
02:12:33PM 19	that I hear that and it influences decisions about what	02:15:34PM 19	A. Well, I obtained them from Mr. Herschlifer who is working
02:12:39PM 20	disbursements number to put into that spreadsheet, it's going to	02:15:39PM 20	with me, but I imagine Mr. Herschlifer obtained them from the
02:12:43PM 21	change the bottom line.	02:15:42PM 21	Plaintiffs' attorneys.
02:12:44PM 22	Q. Professor Cornell, do you prefer "professor" or "doctor"?	02:15:43PM 22	Q. Aside from documents that you believe Mr. Herschlifer
02:12:50PM 23	A. I think "professor." "Doctor" sounds too medical to me.	02:15:50PM 23	obtained from Plaintiffs' counsel, do you know if you or any of
02:12:53PM 24	Q. All right. Professor Cornell, when were you first hired to	02:15:53PM 24	your associates obtained documents from any other source?
02:12:56PM 25	work on the Cobell case?	02:15:58PM 25	A. Well, some of the information we, "we" being CRA, obtained
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
4	325		327
02:12:57PM 1	A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months	02:16:03PM 1	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long-
02:13:03PM 2	A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago.	02:16:09PM 2	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3	A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago.Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3 02:13:07PM 4	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule.
02:13:03PM	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? 	02:16:09PM	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury.
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:12PM 6	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long-time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57,
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:13PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot?
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3 02:13:07PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:37PM 7 02:16:41PM 8	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:21PM 9	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:34PM 8 02:16:44PM 9	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:13PM 5 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:21PM 9	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:44PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 10	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:21PM 9	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:34PM 8 02:16:44PM 9	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 3 02:13:07PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:49PM 10 02:16:53PM 11	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:07PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:18PM 8 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:34PM 12	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:49PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:55PM 12	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:34PM 12	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:34PM 9 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 11 02:16:58PM 11 02:16:58PM 12 02:17:01PM 13	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case.
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:28PM 12 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 12	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:49PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:53PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:02PM 14	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:07PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:18PM 8 02:13:21PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:24PM 12 02:13:34PM 13 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:35PM 15	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:49PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:55PM 12 02:17:04PM 13 02:17:04PM 14 02:17:04PM 15	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:24PM 12 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:34PM 16	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:34PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:55PM 12 02:17:04PM 13 02:17:04PM 15	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct?
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:22PM 10 02:13:24PM 11 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:35PM 15 02:13:42PM 16 02:13:45PM 16	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:30PM 6 02:16:30PM 7 02:16:31PM 8 02:16:41PM 9 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 11 02:16:59PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:09PM 15 02:17:09PM 16 02:17:11PM 17	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct.
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:07PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 8 02:13:21PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:28PM 12 02:13:34PM 13 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:42PM 16 02:13:45PM 17 02:13:45PM 17	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:13PM 3 02:16:23PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:30PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:49PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:53PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:02PM 14 02:17:09PM 15 02:17:13PM 16 02:17:13PM 17	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example,
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:21PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:28PM 12 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:35PM 15 02:13:35PM 16 02:13:35PM 17 02:13:50PM 18 02:13:50PM 18	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:34PM 9 02:16:34PM 10 02:16:34PM 11 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:55PM 12 02:17:04PM 13 02:17:04PM 15 02:17:04PM 15 02:17:04PM 15 02:17:04PM 16 02:17:04PM 17	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:23PM 10 02:13:24PM 11 02:13:24PM 12 02:13:24PM 15 02:13:24PM 16 02:13:24PM 16 02:13:25PM 17 02:13:25PM 17 02:13:25PM 18 02:13:25PM 19	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. Q. That's Charles River? 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:39PM 5 02:16:39PM 6 02:16:39PM 7 02:16:31PM 8 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 10 02:16:58PM 11 02:16:58PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:09PM 15 02:17:09PM 16 02:17:13PM 17 02:17:13PM 18 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in connection with your analysis, correct?
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:23PM 10 02:13:24PM 11 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:34PM 16 02:13:35PM 17 02:13:35PM 18 02:13:35PM 19 02:13:35PM 20 02:13:34PM 21	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. Q. That's Charles River? A. It used to be Charles River, but it's renamed itself CRA 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:30PM 5 02:16:30PM 6 02:16:30PM 7 02:16:31PM 8 02:16:34PM 9 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 10 02:16:49PM 11 02:16:59PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:09PM 15 02:17:19PM 15 02:17:19PM 15 02:17:19PM 17 02:17:19PM 18 02:17:19PM 19 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:24PM 20	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in connection with your analysis, correct? A. Yes.
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:07PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:12PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:18PM 8 02:13:21PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:35PM 16 02:13:45PM 17 02:13:50PM 18 02:13:51PM 19 02:13:53PM 20 02:13:54PM 21 02:13:54PM 21	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. Q. That's Charles River? A. It used to be Charles River, but it's renamed itself CRA International. 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:41PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:53PM 12 02:17:04PM 13 02:17:04PM 15 02:17:04PM 16 02:17:14PM 17 02:17:14PM 17 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in connection with your analysis, correct? A. Yes. Q. Did you review any documents such as journal vouchers?
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:18PM 8 02:13:21PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:42PM 16 02:13:45PM 17 02:13:50PM 18 02:13:51PM 19 02:13:51PM 19 02:13:53PM 20 02:13:54PM 21	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. Q. That's Charles River? A. It used to be Charles River, but it's renamed itself CRA International. Q. Who's spoken to you in connection with your engagement on 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:33PM 5 02:16:33PM 6 02:16:33PM 7 02:16:34PM 8 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 10 02:16:53PM 11 02:16:55PM 12 02:17:05PM 15 02:17:05PM 16 02:17:19PM 17 02:17:13PM 18 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19 02:17:14PM 19	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in connection with your analysis, correct? A. Yes. Q. Did you review any documents such as journal vouchers? A. I may have, but I'm not sure. I don't recall specifically.
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 6 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:28PM 10 02:13:28PM 11 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:34PM 16 02:13:45PM 17 02:13:50PM 18 02:13:51PM 19 02:13:54PM 20 02:13:54PM 21 02:13:54PM 21 02:13:54PM 21	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. Q. That's Charles River? A. It used to be Charles River, but it's renamed itself CRA International. Q. Who's spoken to you in connection with your engagement on this case? In other words, what I'm trying to learn is, since 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:39PM 5 02:16:39PM 6 02:16:39PM 7 02:16:31PM 8 02:16:34PM 9 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 11 02:16:55PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:05PM 15 02:17:05PM 16 02:17:15PM 17 02:17:15PM 18 02:17:15PM 19 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:23PM 21 02:17:23PM 22 02:17:23PM 22 02:17:23PM 23	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in connection with your analysis, correct? A. Yes. Q. Did you review any documents such as journal vouchers? A. I may have, but I'm not sure. I don't recall specifically. Q. In forming your opinions is it fair to say you've assumed
02:13:03PM 2 02:13:03PM 4 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:10PM 5 02:13:13PM 7 02:13:13PM 9 02:13:23PM 10 02:13:23PM 11 02:13:24PM 12 02:13:34PM 12 02:13:34PM 14 02:13:34PM 15 02:13:45PM 17 02:13:50PM 18 02:13:51PM 19 02:13:53PM 20 02:13:54PM 21 02:13:54PM 21 02:13:54PM 21 02:13:54PM 22 02:14:00PM 23 02:14:00PM 24	 A. I don't know precisely, but recently, two, three months ago. Q. And prior to your being hired to work on the case, did you have any background or experience working with the individual Indian trust system? A. No. Q. Approximately how many hours have you spent reviewing materials in connection with your engagement on this case? A. I don't know exactly, but in the range of fifty to a hundred. Q. And you mentioned during your testimony that you were assisted by staff? A. Yes. Q. And approximately how many people were assisting you? A. There were three primary individuals who have worked on this project from CRA International. Q. And that's your company, right, or that's the company you're associated with? A. I'm a senior consultant to that company. Q. That's Charles River? A. It used to be Charles River, but it's renamed itself CRA International. Q. Who's spoken to you in connection with your engagement on this case? In other words, what I'm trying to learn is, since we haven't met before, I'm trying to get an understanding as to 	02:16:09PM 2 02:16:39PM 4 02:16:39PM 5 02:16:39PM 6 02:16:39PM 7 02:16:31PM 8 02:16:34PM 9 02:16:44PM 9 02:16:44PM 11 02:16:55PM 12 02:17:01PM 13 02:17:05PM 15 02:17:05PM 16 02:17:15PM 17 02:17:15PM 18 02:17:15PM 19 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:24PM 20 02:17:23PM 21 02:17:23PM 22 02:17:23PM 22 02:17:23PM 23	because I happened to know the sources for that, like a long- time series on Treasury bond data. That was obtained from Professor Schiller's website. I'm trying to think if there were any others. There were things like the Treasury debt schedule. We obtained that directly from the U.S. Treasury. Q. Are you referring to the, it was I think Plaintiffs' 57, the Treasury direct website shot? A. Yes, yes. And there were probably other documents that I couldn't tell you which they are that CRA staff obtained directly, such as the Treasury information from websites rather than getting it through the Plaintiffs' attorneys, but by the time it was shown to me its source wasn't noted, just it was a document in the case. Q. Fair to say, though, that the overwhelming majority of documents that you reviewed were the historical materials provided by Plaintiffs' counsel; is that correct? A. I think that's correct. Q. And you've talked about reviewing, for example, Commissioner of Indian reports, Indian Affairs reports in connection with your analysis, correct? A. Yes. Q. Did you review any documents such as journal vouchers? A. I may have, but I'm not sure. I don't recall specifically. Q. In forming your opinions is it fair to say you've assumed that money has been wrongfully withheld from the IIM trust

	328		330
02:17:42PM 1	accounts?	02:20:26PM 1	A, but would you please describe the process that went into
02:17:42PM 2	A. Well, I didn't make that assumption, per se. I eventually	02:20:31PM 2	preparing Attachment A? In other words, what was your role and
02:17:49PM 3	made the assumptions that went into Attachment A, but I did say	02:20:34PM 3	how did you all decide to undertake this approach?
4	to counsel in this matter that I was not a historian and had not		
F		F	A. Well, the first thing I did was have extensive conversation
6	been working on this matter long enough to have delved into the	_	with Plaintiffs' counsel to understand the legal framework in
7	nature of each number, so to some extent I would be operating at	02:20:50PM 6	which a calculation would be done. And this would be somewhat
02:18:10PM 7	a high level that may have to be refined.	02:20:56PM 7	analogous to the damages versus restitution discussion that I
02:18:13PM 8	Q. Now, I know you were sitting in court part of yesterday and	02:20:59PM 8	started with and Professor Laycok talked about in detail, and I
02:18:17PM 9	this morning when Dr. Miller was testifying so you heard some	02:21:06PM 9	learned what they were looking for was a model that would
02:18:21PM 10	testimony about the Treasury general account. Prior to your	02:21:09PM 10	reflect benefits to the government, which I explained would be
02:18:26PM 11	coming to court this week had you heard about the Treasury	02:21:14PM 11	damages to, let's say, a class of Indians, so once I understood
02:18:28PM 12	general account?	02:21:20PM 12	that, I said the benefits to the government, I pretty much then
02:18:29PM 13	A. Yes.	02:21:24PM 13	knew what to do. The financial economics of Attachment A are
02:18:29PM 14	Q. And is that something you have a fair amount of familiarity	02:21:31PM 14	things that I've done in the past that I knew how to do and so I
02:18:32PM 15	with from your work?	02:21:35PM 15	basically developed the template for it and said that we're
02:18:34PM 16	A. Well, there's a great amount to know about Treasury	02:21:41PM 16	going to have to do a lot of work to find the right numbers to
02:18:38PM 17	finance, but I worked on the Treasury bidding scandal for Warren	02:21:43PM 17	go in there.
02:18:43PM 18	Buffett back in 1986, so as part of that assignment I spent some	02:21:44PM 18	Q. So was it you that decided, and I'm going to have to ask if
02:18:47PM 19	time learning about government debt financing and the operation	02:21:49PM 19	we could have Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41 put up. We can just go to
02:18:50PM 20	of the Treasury, but it's been a while.	02:21:55PM 20	the first page. Were you the person who actually made the
02:18:52PM 21	Q. Okay. And aside from what you've heard this week, for	02:22:03PM 21	decision to have the various columns in Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41?
02:18:57PM 22	example, did you have a sense as to how much money typically was	02:22:06PM 22	A. Well, some, but not some I had to learn facts from
02:19:01PM 23	in the Treasury general account?	02:22:10PM 23	others. For example, I had no idea about this Osage calculated
02:19:02PM 24	A. I didn't that \$5 billion number that I saw in a	02:22:16PM 24	or Osage corrected, but it was my view that the critical columns
02:19:08PM 25	document, that was the first time I saw that as working balance.	02:22:23PM 25	would be you need a measure of revenues and you need a measure
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	329		331
02:19:11PM 1	329 I didn't know that prior.	02:22:28PM 1	331 of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include
02:19:11PM 1 02:19:12PM 2		02:22:28PM 1 02:22:33PM 2	
2	I didn't know that prior.	2	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include
02:19:12PM 2	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed	02:22:33PM 2	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes.	02:22:33PM 2 02:22:36PM 3	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes.	02:22:33PM 2 02:22:36PM 3 02:22:41PM 4	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes.	02:22:38PM	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes.	02:22:38PM 2 02:22:38PM 3 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:50PM 6	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any	02:22:38PM 2 02:22:36PM 3 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:50PM 6 02:22:55PM 7	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 8	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct?	02:22:33PM 2 02:22:38PM 3 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:56PM 6 02:22:55PM 7 02:22:56PM 8	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government.
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:15PM 3 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 8 02:19:33PM 9 02:19:33PM 10	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no.	02:22:33PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:56PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:56PM 8 02:23:00PM 9 02:23:00PM 10	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 8 02:19:33PM 9 02:19:33PM 10	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct?	02:22:3SPM 2 02:22:3SPM 3 02:22:4IPM 4 02:22:4SPM 5 02:22:5OPM 6 02:22:5SPM 7 02:22:5SPM 8 02:23:0OPM 9 02:23:03PM 10	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you?
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 8 02:19:33PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:34PM 11	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use	02:22:33PM 2 02:22:43PM 4 02:22:43PM 5 02:22:45PM 6 02:22:55PM 7 02:22:56PM 8 02:23:03PM 9 02:23:03PM 10 02:23:07PM 11	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that.
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:34PM 11 02:19:40PM 12	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working	02:22:38PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:50PM 6 02:22:55PM 7 02:22:56PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:07PM 11 02:23:11PM 12	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right?
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 8 02:19:33PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:34PM 11 02:19:44PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 14	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief	02:22:33PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 8 02:22:56PM 9 02:23:03PM 10 02:23:07PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:15PM 13 02:23:16PM 14	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that.
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:44PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:43PM 14 02:19:43PM 15	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:45PM 5 02:22:55PM 6 02:22:55PM 7 02:22:55PM 9 02:23:05PM 10 02:23:05PM 11 02:23:15PM 12 02:23:15PM 13 02:23:15PM 14 02:23:15PM 15	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay.
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:22PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:40PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:49PM 14 02:19:53PM 14	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago?	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:50PM 6 02:22:55PM 7 02:22:56PM 8 02:23:00PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:01PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:15PM 13 02:23:15PM 14 02:23:15PM 15 02:23:15PM 16	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:15PM 3 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 5 02:19:23PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 8 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:44PM 11 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 14 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes.	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:56PM 8 02:23:00PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:07PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:13PM 13 02:23:19PM 15 02:23:19PM 16 02:23:19PM 16 02:23:20PM 17	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:34PM 11 02:19:34PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 14 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:41PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:56PM 6 02:22:55PM 7 02:22:55PM 9 02:23:05PM 10 02:23:05PM 11 02:23:15PM 12 02:23:16PM 14 02:23:16PM 15 02:23:16PM 16 02:23:20PM 17 02:23:20PM 17	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you?
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:40PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:45PM 14 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:19:55PM 18	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only	02:22:36PM	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw,
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:22PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:34PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 14 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:19:55PM 19 02:19:55PM 19	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference?	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:56PM 9 02:23:05PM 10 02:23:07PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:15PM 14 02:23:15PM 15 02:23:19PM 16 02:23:25PM 17 02:23:25PM 18 02:23:25PM 19 02:23:25PM 19	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:22PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:34PM 12 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:19:55PM 19 02:20:05PM 20 02:20:06PM 21	 I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference? A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment A. 	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:56PM 8 02:23:00PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:07PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:13PM 13 02:23:19PM 15 02:23:19PM 16 02:23:19PM 16 02:23:28PM 17 02:23:28PM 19 02:23:32PM 20 02:23:33PM 21	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:34PM 11 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:00:05PM 20 02:20:05PM 20 02:20:05PM 22	 I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference? A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment A. For example, the CPNR data were not available a month or so ago, 	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:56PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:00PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:14PM 15 02:23:15PM 15 02:23:15PM 16 02:23:25PM 17 02:23:25PM 18 02:23:25PM 19 02:23:25PM 20 02:23:35PM 20 02:23:35PM 21	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic payments to individual recipients. It's just, as I testified
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:15PM 3 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:34PM 12 02:19:34PM 14 02:19:35PM 15 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:00:05PM 20 02:20:05PM 21 02:20:05PM 21	 I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference? A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment A. For example, the CPNR data were not available a month or so ago, so that's changed. You'd have to show me which particular 	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:55PM 8 02:23:00PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:00PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:14PM 14 02:23:14PM 15 02:23:15PM 16 02:23:15PM 16 02:23:24PM 17 02:23:24PM 19 02:23:24PM 19 02:23:35PM 20 02:23:35PM 21 02:23:35PM 21 02:23:35PM 21	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic payments to individual recipients. It's just, as I testified before, pretty scattered data as far as I've seen to this point.
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 4 02:19:15PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:33PM 12 02:19:34PM 13 02:19:34PM 14 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:20:05PM 20 02:20:05PM 21 02:20:05PM 21 02:20:15PM 22	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference? A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment A. For example, the CPNR data were not available a month or so ago, so that's changed. You'd have to show me which particular version you have before I could tell you for sure.	02-22-35PM 2 02-22-36PM 4 02-22-46PM 5 02-22-46PM 6 02-22-56PM 7 02-22-56PM 8 02-23-00PM 9 02-23-00PM 10 02-23-16PM 11 02-23-13PM 13 02-23-16PM 15 02-23-19PM 16 02-23-20PM 17 02-23-20PM 17 02-23-20PM 19 02-23-32PM 20 02-23-32PM 20 02-23-33PM 21 02-23-33PM 21 02-23-33PM 22 02-23-33PM 22	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic payments to individual recipients. It's just, as I testified before, pretty scattered data as far as I've seen to this point. Q. Did that surprise you looking back at a history of over a
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 3 02:19:19PM 4 02:19:19PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 9 02:19:33PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:40PM 12 02:19:40PM 14 02:19:53PM 15 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:19:55PM 19 02:20:05PM 20 02:20:05PM 21	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference? A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment A. For example, the CPNR data were not available a month or so ago, so that's changed. You'd have to show me which particular version you have before I could tell you for sure. Q. Well, if that's necessary we'll get to the old Attachment	02:22:35PM 2 02:22:36PM 4 02:22:46PM 5 02:22:46PM 6 02:22:56PM 7 02:22:55PM 8 02:23:00PM 9 02:23:00PM 10 02:23:00PM 11 02:23:11PM 12 02:23:14PM 14 02:23:14PM 15 02:23:15PM 16 02:23:15PM 16 02:23:24PM 17 02:23:24PM 19 02:23:24PM 19 02:23:35PM 20 02:23:35PM 21 02:23:35PM 21 02:23:35PM 21	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic payments to individual recipients. It's just, as I testified before, pretty scattered data as far as I've seen to this point. Q. Did that surprise you looking back at a history of over a hundred years?
02:19:12PM 2 02:19:16PM 4 02:19:16PM 5 02:19:22PM 6 02:19:22PM 7 02:19:23PM 7 02:19:23PM 10 02:19:33PM 11 02:19:34PM 11 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:44PM 13 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 16 02:19:55PM 17 02:19:55PM 18 02:20:06PM 20 02:20:06PM 21 02:20:15PM 22 02:20:15PM 23 02:20:15PM 24	I didn't know that prior. Q. And you're referring to the GAO report that was reviewed yesterday I believe with Dr. Miller? A. I think that was it, yes. Q. It was a GAO report about debt management? A. Yes. Q. I gather you've never published any articles or done any research studies related to the Treasury general account; is that correct? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Now, I'd like to talk about we've referred to you've referred to Attachment A, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41, and I may use those terms interchangeably. We were up until today working with a version of Attachment A which was attached to a brief filed by the Plaintiffs' counsel. You're familiar with that document, are you not, from a couple of months ago? A. I think so, yes. Q. This is slightly different. It appears that it's just some numbers have been rounded, that is basically the only difference? A. You know, there's been a couple versions of Attachment A. For example, the CPNR data were not available a month or so ago, so that's changed. You'd have to show me which particular version you have before I could tell you for sure.	02-22-35PM 2 02-22-36PM 4 02-22-46PM 5 02-22-46PM 6 02-22-56PM 7 02-22-56PM 8 02-23-00PM 9 02-23-00PM 10 02-23-16PM 11 02-23-13PM 13 02-23-16PM 15 02-23-19PM 16 02-23-20PM 17 02-23-20PM 17 02-23-20PM 19 02-23-32PM 20 02-23-32PM 20 02-23-33PM 21 02-23-33PM 21 02-23-33PM 22 02-23-33PM 22	of disbursements, and in disbursements you would have to include things like theft, because if we're doing a benefit to the government analysis, then suppose somebody just wrote a check to themselves or somehow faudulently took money. That would be a damage to the Indians but not a benefit to the government, so disbursements would have to be net of all disbursements that did not benefit the government. Q. By the way, you didn't actually see any evidence of fraud when were you doing your disbursements calculation, did you? A. No, not per se, but, you know, I thought with a-hundred-and-some years and processing being what they are, I would be surprised if there wasn't some of that. Q. There may have been a crook somewhere, right? A. Right. I don't have any direct evidence of that. Q. Okay. A. At any rate Q. And you certainly I gather in the materials that you reviewed didn't see any evidence of systemic fraud, did you? A. No. But part of the problem is that everything that I saw, it seems extraordinarly incomplete, so I didn't really see evidence of systemic anything like clear evidence of systemic payments to individual recipients. It's just, as I testified before, pretty scattered data as far as I've seen to this point. Q. Did that surprise you looking back at a history of over a

	332		334
02:23:55PM 1	A. No. You had somewhat the same problem with Swiss banking	02:27:40PM 1	government-calculated numbers.
02:24:01PM 2	records related to the Holocaust. There were and that was	02:27:42PM 2	Q. Well, I know, and you referred to that in your direct
02:24:08PM 3	only since 1945. Changes had occurred, documents had been lost	02:27:45PM 3	examination, so I want to be clear. Is it your understanding
02:24:11PM 4	or destroyed. That is a problem with these long-run issues.	02:27:49PM 4	that Columns C and D are simply two different measures of the
02:24:17PM 5	Q. Now, you specifically referred to the Osage government	02:27:56PM 5	same activity?
02:24:22PM 6	calculated and the Osage corrected columns as being columns that	02:27:56PM 6	A. Yes.
02:24:27PM 7	you didn't decide I guess needed to be in there; is that	02:27:58PM 7	Q. And so you, for example let me just give you a different
02:24:31PM 8	correct?	02:28:09PM 8	view on Osage as a hypothetical. Assume that revenues from the
02:24:31PM 9	A. Correct. At the time I started I didn't know anything	02:28:16PM 9	Osage lands go into a tribal account, not an individual account.
02:24:35PM 10	about any revenues earned by the Osage tribe.	02:28:24PM 10	A. Yes.
02:24:39PM 11	Q. And so how did you learn about the Osage revenues?	02:28:24PM 11	Q. And monies from that tribal account are disbursed directly
02:24:43PM 12	A. Conversations with my staff and with counsel, looking at	02:28:31PM 12	to individuals, not to a trust account but to individuals who
02:24:49PM 13	documents, having meetings, trying to put together what the	02:28:36PM 13	have what are called headright interests. Are you with me?
02:24:56PM 14	total revenues earned for the IIM trusts were.	02:28:40PM 14	A. Yes.
02:25:00PM 15	Q. Now, in the course of your work have you gained any	02:28:40PM 15	Q. In that case, those monies would not flow through the IIM
02:25:02PM 16	understanding as to why the Osage revenues might be treated as	02:28:45PM 16	trust; is that correct?
02:25:07PM 17	unique from other revenues?	02:28:46PM 17	A. The way you've defined it, that sounds like that's correct,
02:25:09PM 18	A. Just at a high level.	02:28:52PM 18	yes.
02:25:12PM 19	Q. Well, give us your best high-level understanding.	02:28:53PM 19	Q. And if in fact you've included those types of revenues in
02:25:16PM 20	A. Well, the Osage tribe has occupied lands that have	02:28:57PM 20	the Osage corrected amounts in Column D, would you agree that
02:25:22PM 21	particularly large oil and gas reserves, and some of the	02:29:02PM 21	those amounts should come out of the calculation?
02:25:25PM 22	individual Indian lands have wells on them and there's wellhead	02:29:06PM 22	A. If the amounts never flowed into the IIM trust then they
02:25:33PM 23	rights, so accounting for first of all, more dollars are	02:29:14PM 23	should not be in my calculation.
02:25:36PM 24	involved than for most land, and second of all, accounting for	02:29:15PM 24	Q. Okay. And have you ever done a calculation to get a sense
02:25:40PM 25	them depend on how you treat those wellhead rights and so forth.	02:29:28PM 25	as to how much of the \$58 billion that you showed us your bottom
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
02:25:50PM 1	333 Q. Putting aside the Osage for a moment, have you ever heard	02:29:35PM 1	335 line, how much of that is attributable to the difference between
02:25:53PM 2	Taking uside the esage for a moment, have you ever heard		line, now mach of that is attributable to the unference between
	the term land-based LIM accountholders or something like that?	n2:29:40PM 2	the use of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage
2	the term land-based IIM accountholders or something like that? A. What's that?	02:29:40PM 2	the use of Column D versus the use of the government's Osage
02:25:58PM 3	A. What's that?	02:29:46PM 3	calculation?
02:25:58PM 3	A. What's that?Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d?	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see.
02:25:58PM 3 02:25:58PM 4	A. What's that?	02:29:46PM 3	calculation?
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the 	02-29-4FPM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals.
02:25:58PM	A. What's that?Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d?A. No, I don't think so.	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks.
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals.
02:25:58PM 4 02:25:58PM 5 02:26:02PM 5 02:26:03PM 6 02:26:09PM 7 02:26:17PM 8	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the
02:25:58PM 4 02:25:58PM 5 02:26:02PM 5 02:26:03PM 6 02:26:09PM 7 02:26:17PM 8 02:26:18PM 9 02:26:14PM 10 02:26:34PM 11	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion?
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right.
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:17PM 10 02:30:21PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:24PM 13 02:30:27PM 14	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? 	02:29:46PM	calculation? A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an IIM trust and then the 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:13PM 10 02:30:24PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:26PM 13 02:30:26PM 14 02:30:32PM 15 02:30:36PM 16	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an ITM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:17PM 10 02:30:21PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:25PM 13 02:30:25PM 14 02:30:32PM 15 02:30:36PM 16 02:30:42PM 17	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5,
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an ITM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:17PM 10 02:30:21PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:25PM 13 02:30:27PM 14 02:30:32PM 15 02:30:36PM 16 02:30:42PM 17 02:30:42PM 17	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an IIM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:13PM 10 02:30:21PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:26PM 13 02:30:25PM 14 02:30:32PM 15 02:30:36PM 16 02:30:42PM 17 02:30:50PM 18 02:30:55PM 19	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent.
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an ITM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two "corrects." 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:13PM 10 02:30:21PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:24PM 13 02:30:25PM 15 02:30:32PM 16 02:30:32PM 17 02:30:42PM 17 02:30:53PM 18 02:30:53PM 19 02:30:53PM 20	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent. Q. That's like about eleven-plus billion dollars?
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an HM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two "corrects." A. Well, I'm really not the detailed expert on the Osage 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:00PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:17PM 10 02:30:21PM 11 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:24PM 13 02:30:27PM 16 02:30:32PM 16 02:30:32PM 17 02:30:32PM 17 02:30:50PM 18 02:30:57PM 20 02:31:05PM 21	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent. Q. That's like about eleven-plus billion dollars? A. Yes.
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an ITM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two "corrects." A. Well, I'm really not the detailed expert on the Osage accounting, but in conversations with plaintiff counsel it is 	0229:46PM 3 0229:47PM 4 0229:54PM 5 0229:55PM 6 0230:00PM 7 0230:03PM 8 0230:13PM 9 0230:13PM 10 0230:21PM 11 0230:24PM 12 0230:24PM 13 0230:24PM 15 0230:32PM 16 0230:32PM 17 0230:35PM 16 0230:35PM 17 0230:55PM 20 0231:05PM 21 0231:05PM 22 0231:05PM 22 0231:05PM 24	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent. Q. That's like about eleven-plus billion dollars? A. Yes. Q. I wanted to ask you a couple more questions about the
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an ITM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two "corrects." A. Well, I'm really not the detailed expert on the Osage accounting, but in conversations with plaintiff counsel it is their belief, and I believe they believe they can show that the 	02:29:46PM 3 02:29:47PM 4 02:29:54PM 5 02:29:55PM 6 02:30:00PM 7 02:30:03PM 8 02:30:13PM 9 02:30:13PM 10 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:24PM 12 02:30:24PM 15 02:30:32PM 16 02:30:32PM 16 02:30:32PM 17 02:30:53PM 19 02:30:53PM 19 02:30:53PM 20 02:31:06PM 21	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent. Q. That's like about eleven-plus billion dollars? A. Yes. Q. I wanted to ask you a couple more questions about the methodology on Attachment A. I know your background includes
02:25:58PM	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an HM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two "corrects." A. Well, I'm really not the detailed expert on the Osage accounting, but in conversations with plaintiff counsel it is their belief, and I believe they believe they can show that the data collected by the tribe are more accurate as to the actual 	0229:46PM 3 0229:47PM 4 0229:54PM 5 0229:55PM 6 0230:00PM 7 0230:03PM 8 0230:13PM 9 0230:13PM 10 0230:21PM 11 0230:24PM 12 0230:24PM 13 0230:24PM 15 0230:32PM 16 0230:32PM 17 0230:35PM 16 0230:35PM 17 0230:55PM 20 0231:05PM 21 0231:05PM 22 0231:05PM 22 0231:05PM 24	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent. Q. That's like about eleven-plus billion dollars? A. Yes. Q. I wanted to ask you a couple more questions about the methodology on Attachment A. I know your background includes statistics, you have a master's in statistics and you've
0225.58PM 4 0226.58PM 4 0226.03PM 6 0226.03PM 7 0226.17PM 8 0226.18PM 10 0226.34PM 11 0226.34PM 12 0226.34PM 15 0226.58PM 16 0227.06PM 17 0227.06PM 18 0227.16PM 19 0227.16PM 20 0227.16PM 21 0227.16PM 21 0227.38PM 22 0227.38PM 23 0227.38PM 23	 A. What's that? Q. Land-based, I-a-n-d hyphen b-a-s-e-d? A. No, I don't think so. Q. Do you have an understanding as to how most members of the class become entitled to collect revenues from their land interests? A. No, I don't think so. Q. So if in the case of the Osage do you have an understanding as to whether those revenues go directly from, say, the oil and gas producers to the individual accounts? A. No. It's my understanding they do not. Q. So what is your understanding about how the revenues from oil and gas go in the case of Osage? A. They are aggregated into an IIM trust and then the individuals are allocated payments out of that trust. Q. Now, and that's why you've gone ahead and calculated an Osage corrected column; is that correct? Sorry for the two "corrects." A. Well, I'm really not the detailed expert on the Osage accounting, but in conversations with plaintiff counsel it is their belief, and I believe they believe they can show that the data collected by the tribe are more accurate as to the actual receipts that would have gone into the trust than the 	0229:46PM 3 0229:47PM 4 0229:54PM 5 0229:55PM 6 0230:00PM 7 0230:03PM 8 0230:13PM 9 0230:13PM 10 0230:21PM 11 0230:24PM 12 0230:24PM 13 0230:24PM 15 0230:32PM 16 0230:32PM 17 0230:35PM 16 0230:35PM 17 0230:55PM 20 0231:05PM 21 0231:05PM 22 0231:05PM 22 0231:05PM 24	A. I haven't, but if we went to the bottom, maybe we can see. Q. If you want to go A. I don't know if the totals I need to see the totals. Q. You want to go to the last page. Thanks. Be careful with the back of the envelope. I embarrassed myself a little, I was off by a fact, but here I think we can see how that might work. You notice that the difference between the corrected revenues and disbursements is about \$4-and-a-half billion? Q. Right. A. And that translates up into when you consider the long period of time and the interest rate, about 58 billion. The difference between Osage corrected and Osage calculated looks to be about nine hundred million, so that's about 1/5 of the 4.5, about twenty percent. I would suspect that undoing that would reduce the number therefore by about twenty percent. Q. That's like about eleven-plus billion dollars? A. Yes. Q. I wanted to ask you a couple more questions about the methodology on Attachment A. I know your background includes statistics, you have a master's in statistics and you've obviously done work in statistics, correct?

	336		338
02:31:21PM 1	A. Yes.	02:34:09PM 1	Q. All right. Now, let's go ahead and look at why don't
02:31:21PM 2	Q. Okay. Does Attachment A represent a regression, the	02:34:17PM 2	you go back to the first page of Plaintiffs' 41. As I
02:31:26PM 3	product of a regression analysis?	02:34:22PM 3	understand it, when you take your seventy percent, you look at
02:31:28PM 4	A. I did regressions to, quote, fill in the blanks, but I in	02:34:27PM 4	your total revenues for a particular year, like year, let's go
02:31:33PM 5	fact didn't use them. I just used a simple linear	02:34:35PM 5	to the bottom, 1915, Column E; is that correct?
02:31:39PM 6	interpolation.	02:34:41PM 6	A. Yes.
02:31:39PM 7	Q. Are there other ways to fill in missing data becides a	02:34:42PM 7	Q. And that's the one that you multiply times .7?
02:31:43PM 8	linear interpolation?	02:34:45PM 8	A. Correct.
02:31:46PM 9	A. Yes. I looked at four or five, and there's probably many	02:34:47PM 9	Q. To get disbursements of 5.7?
02:31:49PM 10	more than the ones that I looked at, but I looked at some of the	02:34:50PM 10	A. Yes.
02:31:51PM 11	standard techniques.	02:34:51PM 11	Q. And then what happens to the remain the difference
02:31:52PM 12	Q. What are some of those standard techniques?	02:34:55PM 12	between the 5.7? What is that, 2.46; is that right? What
02:31:54PM 13 02:32:00PM 14	A. Well, you can use a regression model, a standard linear	02:35:03PM 13 02:35:03PM 14	happens to the difference?
02:32:00PM 14 02:32:04PM 15	regression model. You could use a logrythmic aggression, you	02:35:03PM 14 02:35:07PM 15	A. It's assumed that that the model effectively assumes
16	could use an exponential smoothing model. I found that as long as I focused on the 1887-to-1972 period the bottom line was not	02:35:07PM 15	that that difference is available to the government for use. Q. Didn't get
02:32:09PM 10 02:32:16PM 17	very sensitive to how I filled in the blanks.	02:35:11PM 10	A. Except to the extent that it built up an external account.
02:32:16PM 17	Q. Have you ever, and I'm sure you have, but I have to ask it	02:35:13PM 17	Q. I'm sorry, except to the extent that it built up an external account.
02:32:18PM 19	this way anyway, have you ever heard the term multi-variate	02:35:18PM 10	A. Except to the extent that it builds up in an external
02:32:29PM 20	model?	02:35:23PM 20	account.
02:32:29PM 21	A. Multi-variate regression.	02:35:23PM 21	Q. What does that mean?
02:32:31PM 22	Q. I'll take that one.	02:35:24PM 22	A. Well, if you go to the very end, and I talked about this in
02:32:32PM 23	A. Yes.	02:35:29PM 23	my direct, but go to the last page, you have a balance of 423
02:32:32PM 24	Q. What is a multi-variate regression?	02:35:34PM 24	million. If all of those funds, all of those two-point whatever
02:32:36PM 25	A. It's where you try to explain a variable, like, let's say,	02:35:40PM 25	you said it was, 2.4.
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
_	337	_	339
02:32:41PM I	sales of iphones by a number of other variables such as GNP or	02:35:42PM 1	Q. 2.46?
2	sales of other Apple products where you don't just use one explanatory variable. You have several.		A. 2.46, if all of those had simply been dumped into another account and not touched and just built up for a hundred years,
02:32:58PM 3	Q. Are there any advantages to using more than one variable?	02:35:49PM 3	hundred plus years, I presume you'd have a number pretty close
02:32:59PM 5	A. As long as you have a reasonable basis for so doing, and	02:35:56PM 5	to \$58 billion. That obviously did not happen because we don't
02:33:09PM 6	it's not data-fishing, there would be, yes.	02:36:01PM 6	have that sort of money, so I don't know what happened to it,
02:33:12PM 7	Q. And what are those advantages?	02:36:05PM 7	but it is an assumption of the model that it was available for
02:33:14PM 8	A. Well, you typically increase the explanatory power by using	02:36:08PM 8	use by the United States government.
02:33:20PM 9	more variables.	02:36:10PM 9	Q. It's an assumption, is it not, that that thirty percent is
02:33:22PM 10	Q. Okay. In the case of Attachment A how many variables did	02:36:14PM 10	never disbursed to the plaintiffs?
02:33:27PM 11	you use?	02:36:18PM 11	A. Except to the extent that it builds up
02:33:28PM 12	A. I just used the actual data itself, though I suspect if I	02:36:22PM 12	Q. Well
02:33:33РМ 13	had done a multi-variate model it would not have much impact	02:36:23PM 13	A. so that is available for disbursement.
02:33:37PM 14	either.	02:36:25PM 14	Q. Well, let's look then oh, we can probably do it with
02:33:37PM 15	Q. Now, I want to get to this 69.82 percent disbursement rate	02:36:30PM 15	this one here. Let me do my calculation real quick.
02:33:45PM 16	that you utilized.	02:36:35PM 16	THE COURT: 58 million isn't money the government
02:33:47PM 17	And you have to bear with me, your Honor. You stole	02:36:37PM 17	spent, it's money the government didn't have to spend, isn't it?
02:33:52PM 18	some of my cross-examination so I'll try not to be duplicative	02:36:41PM 18	It's basically the opportunity cost? I mean, it's interest that
02:33:56PM 19 02:33:57PM 20	on some of these points.	02:36:47PM 19	did not have to be paid because the money did not have to be
02:33:57PM 20	THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Warshawsky.	02:36:50PM 20	borrowed.
02:34:00PM 21	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I wasn't, nor are my co-counsel. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	02:36:51PM 21	THE WITNESS: Correct. But the point I was making is, we can't ignore that some of the money, \$423 million, it hasn't
02:34:04PM 22	Q. I'll just refer as a seventy percent disbursement rate, if	02:36:53PM 22	been used by the government, it is in the account, and it could
02:34:04PM 23	that's okay.	02:37:06PM 23	be disbursed tomorrow presumably to individual Indians.
02:34:07PM 24	A. That's fine.	02:37:06PM 24	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter

	340		342
02:37:07PM 1	Q. We can keep it on this page here.	02:40:19PM 1	revenue number was disbursed.
02:37:09PM 2	We're on the last page of DX Exhibit 41. I'm looking,	02:40:23PM 2	Q. I beg your pardon?
02:37:13PM 3	for example, at 2003, fiscal year 2003, and we take your	02:40:24PM 3	A. It's showing that thirty cents of every corrected revenue
02:37:17PM 4	corrected revenues of roughly 180 million, multiply it times 70	02:40:27PM 4	dollar was disbursed.
02:37:22PM 5	percent, and we get the disbursements of about 126 million,	02:40:29PM 5	Q. Okay. It's showing that that's how you've calculated it on
02:37:26PM 6	right?	02:40:33PM 6	Attachment C?
02:37:26PM 7	A. Yes.	02:40:34PM 7	A. That's correct.
02:37:27PM 8	Q. And then the thirty percent goes off somewhere. The next	02:40:35PM 8	Q. When I say Plaintiffs', I forget what, 56?
02:37:32PM 9	year, 2004, you do the same thing again, right, we take 195	02:40:39PM 9	A. That's correct.
02:37:36PM 10	A. Yes.	02:40:39PM 10	Q. So this is Plaintiffs' 56 is the sole basis for your
02:37:37PM 11	Q. times .7, and we get the 136?	02:40:44PM 11	conclusion that in a given year in every year thirty cents out
02:37:42PM 12	A. Yes.	02:40:50PM 12	of every dollar collected for beneficiaries disappears somewhere
02:37:43PM 13	Q. Isn't it correct, then, that implicit in your model that is	02:40:55PM 13	and never gets distributed to beneficiaries?
02:37:48PM 14	that thirty percent that's collected in a given year is never	02:40:58PM 14	A. That's correct.
02:37:54PM 15	disbursed for over a hundred years?	02:40:59PM 15	Q. Now, Judge Robertson asked some questions which I had in my
02:37:57PM 16	A. Well, you can't say that any particular amount I think	02:41:06PM 16	outline, but you are aware that the number in the pre-1972
02:38:03PM 17	Dr. Miller talked about this wasn't disbursed, because when	02:41:15PM 17	years, you had actual data for disbursements. Judge Robertson
02:38:06PM 18	you disburse monies in 2004, are those new or are those for	02:41:19PM 18	pointed out one for you, I believe, for 1926?
02:38:13PM 19	prior years, but you are saying that thirty percent of the	02:41:22PM 19	A. There were mentions of disbursements in some of the
02:38:17PM 20	money, except to the extent that it goes and builds up in the	02:41:26PM 20	documents I reviewed, yes.
02:38:21PM 21	account with a 423, disappears into the coffers of the Treasury	02:41:27PM 21	Q. Okay. Can you pull up Attachment B, please? I misplaced
22	and goes who knows where to the benefit of the government.	02:41:48PM 22	my version but it doesn't matter. All right. We're back at
0.4	Q. Well, you're saying that this is money, thirty percent of	02:41:54PM 23	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 55. Can you tell from reviewing Plaintiffs'
02:38:35PM 24	revenues collected for the beneficiaries each year never get disbursed to the beneficiaries?	02:41:58PM 2-7 02:42:05PM 25	Exhibit 55 how many years outside the 1988 to 2002 period, how many years you had actual disbursement data that failed to use
02:36:41PW 20	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR	02:42:05PM 2-0	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	341		343
02:38:45PM 1	A. Net of the 423, that's correct.	02:42:08PM 1	343 it?
02:38:45PM 1 02:38:47PM 2		02:42:08PM 1 02:42:09PM 2	
	A. Net of the 423, that's correct.		it?
02:38:47PM 2	A. Net of the 423, that's correct.Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty	02:42:09PM 2	it? A. No.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5	A. Net of the 423, that's correct.Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus	02:42:09PM	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection?
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:28PM 5 02:42:33PM 6	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7	A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government?	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:28PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:33PM 7	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:23PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:37PM 8	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:28PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:14PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:23PM 10	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:23PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9 02:42:56PM 10	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right?
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:27PM 10 02:39:27PM 11	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:24PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:33PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9 02:42:56PM 10 02:42:57PM 11	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:23PM 10 02:39:27PM 11 02:39:20PM 12	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:28PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9 02:42:45PM 10 02:42:57PM 11 02:43:00PM 12	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:23PM 10 02:39:27PM 11	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:24PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:33PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9 02:42:56PM 10 02:42:57PM 11	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:30PM 12 02:39:35PM 13	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:28PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9 02:42:42PM 10 02:42:57PM 11 02:43:00PM 12 02:43:00PM 13	it? A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:16PM 8 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:33PM 12 02:39:34PM 13 02:39:42PM 14	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:23PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:33PM 7 02:42:34PM 8 02:42:42PM 10 02:42:56PM 10 02:42:56PM 11 02:43:06PM 12 02:43:06PM 13	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:35PM 12 02:39:42PM 14 02:39:45PM 15	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:24PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 9 02:42:45PM 10 02:42:56PM 10 02:42:56PM 11 02:43:00PM 12 02:43:03PM 13 02:43:08PM 14 02:43:04PM 15	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:14PM 7 02:39:14PM 9 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:23PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:33PM 12 02:39:34PM 14 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 16	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-33PM 6 02-42-33PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-42PM 9 02-42-5PM 10 02-42-5PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-00PM 13 02-43-00PM 14 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 15	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:14PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:23PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:35PM 12 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:45PM 17	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-33PM 6 02-42-37PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-48PM 9 02-42-48PM 10 02-42-56PM 11 02-43-09PM 12 02-43-09PM 13 02-43-09PM 14 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 16	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable?
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:34PM 14 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:55PM 18	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct 	02:42:09PM 2 02:42:17PM 3 02:42:24PM 4 02:42:24PM 5 02:42:33PM 6 02:42:37PM 7 02:42:42PM 8 02:42:42PM 10 02:42:56PM 10 02:42:56PM 11 02:43:06PM 12 02:43:06PM 14 02:43:14PM 15 02:43:14PM 16 02:43:16PM 17 02:43:16PM 17	A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:16PM 9 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:35PM 15 02:39:42PM 15 02:39:42PM 16 02:39:45PM 17 02:39:55PM 18 02:39:55PM 18	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-33PM 6 02-42-37PM 7 02-42-48PM 9 02-42-48PM 10 02-42-5PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-00PM 13 02-43-00PM 15 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 17 02-43-20PM 18	 A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a detailed and complex analysis.
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:16PM 7 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:23PM 15 02:39:42PM 15 02:39:42PM 15 02:39:42PM 16 02:39:52PM 16 02:39:52PM 17 02:39:52PM 18 02:39:52PM 19 02:40:02PM 20 02:40:03PM 21	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. Q. And how 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-33PM 6 02-42-37PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-42PM 9 02-42-45PM 10 02-42-57PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-09PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 17 02-43-20PM 18 02-43-23PM 19 02-43-23PM 20 02-43-31PM 21 02-43-33PM 21	 A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a detailed and complex analysis. Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true every time you saw a
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:17PM 6 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:30PM 12 02:39:35PM 15 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:45PM 17 02:39:55PM 18 02:39:55PM 19 02:40:02PM 20 02:40:03PM 21	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. Q. And how A. That's what that indicates. 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-33PM 6 02-42-37PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-42PM 9 02-42-45PM 10 02-42-57PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-09PM 14 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 17 02-43-20PM 18 02-43-23PM 19 02-43-23PM 20 02-43-31PM 20	 A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a detailed and complex analysis. Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true every time you saw a disbursement figure that you could have used instead of your
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:23PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:33PM 12 02:39:33PM 14 02:39:34PM 15 02:39:44PM 16 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:45PM 17 02:39:55PM 18 02:39:55PM 18 02:39:55PM 20 02:40:03PM 21 02:40:03PM 21 02:40:04PM 23 02:40:14PM 23 02:40:14PM 23	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. Q. And how A. That's what that indicates. Q. The CPNR dated indicated you're not saying it indicated 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-23PM 6 02-42-33PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-42PM 9 02-42-42PM 10 02-42-5PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-00PM 14 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 17 02-43-20PM 18 02-43-23PM 19 02-43-23PM 20 02-43-34PM 21 02-43-34PM 21 02-43-34PM 21	 A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a detailed and complex analysis. Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true every time you saw a disbursement figure that you could have used instead of your seventy percent imputed value, that disbursement figure was
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:57PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:17PM 6 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:20PM 9 02:39:20PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:30PM 12 02:39:30PM 15 02:39:42PM 14 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:45PM 17 02:39:55PM 18 02:39:55PM 19 02:40:03PM 21 02:40:03PM 21 02:40:03PM 21	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. Q. And how A. That's what that indicates. Q. The CPNR dated indicated you're not saying it indicated that thirty cents out of every dollar failed to get disbursed to plaintiffs, are you? A. Well, it's showing that only seventy cents of the corrected 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-33PM 6 02-42-33PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-42PM 10 02-42-5PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-00PM 14 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 17 02-43-20PM 18 02-43-23PM 19 02-43-23PM 20 02-43-34PM 21	 A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a detailed and complex analysis. Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true every time you saw a disbursement figure that you could have used instead of your seventy percent imputed value, that disbursement figure was actually larger? A. Several of them were right around seventy percent and several others were substantially larger, and one was less than
02:38:47PM 2 02:38:51PM 3 02:38:51PM 4 02:39:07PM 5 02:39:11PM 6 02:39:17PM 8 02:39:23PM 10 02:39:23PM 11 02:39:23PM 12 02:39:23PM 15 02:39:45PM 15 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:45PM 16 02:39:45PM 17 02:39:45PM 18 02:39:45PM 20 02:40:03PM 21 02:40:03PM 21 02:40:03PM 21	 A. Net of the 423, that's correct. Q. Right. And we can confirm that, because if you take thirty percent of your total corrected revenues, the fifteen-plus billion dollars, we're going to get we'll get the disbursements figure, the 10.6 billion, and that's how we're going to get to the 4.6 billion that you show as a nominal benefit to the government? A. Correct. Virtually all of this money in this model leaks out to the benefit of the government. Some stays in the trust and builds up, but it's only 423 million, which is a small fraction of the total potential benefit. Q. Have you reviewed anything that provides with you a factual basis to believe its reasonable to assume that thirty cents out of every dollar collected for beneficiaries stays in the government and never gets paid to beneficiaries? A. I literally couldn't tell you one way or the other. Q. But that's an assumption implicit in your model, isn't it? A. That is an assumption. The only thing I have direct evidence on that is the CPNR data that I looked at. Q. And how A. That's what that indicates. Q. The CPNR dated indicated you're not saying it indicated that thirty cents out of every dollar failed to get disbursed to plaintiffs, are you? 	02-42-09PM 2 02-42-17PM 3 02-42-24PM 4 02-42-28PM 5 02-42-23PM 6 02-42-33PM 7 02-42-42PM 8 02-42-42PM 9 02-42-42PM 10 02-42-5PM 11 02-43-00PM 12 02-43-00PM 14 02-43-14PM 15 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 16 02-43-14PM 17 02-43-20PM 18 02-43-23PM 19 02-43-23PM 20 02-43-34PM 21 02-43-34PM 21 02-43-34PM 21	 A. No. Q. Okay. Can you estimate at all? I mean, any recollection? A. I don't remember from looking at the individual years. The individual years, three or four mentioned disbursements, and I brought this to the attention of plaintiffs' counsel. I said there is numbers here claimed as disbursements which I could use as a disbursement number, and they said they believe that that disbursement data was particularly questionable and that Mr. Pallais do I have the name right? Q. Mr. Pallais, it would be. A. Mr. Pallais would be testifying that that was unreliable data, and I said okay, in that case if that's the position, I won't use that individual data. I will extrapolate backward from the CPNR. Q. When you had that conversation were you told why Mr. Pallais believed that data was unreliable? A. I was told that it was part of a 70-page memo. It was a detailed and complex analysis. Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true every time you saw a disbursement figure that you could have used instead of your seventy percent imputed value, that disbursement figure was actually larger? A. Several of them were right around seventy percent and

	344		346
02:43:49PM 1	seventy percent, as I recall.	02:47:47PM 1	Q. So it was a hundred million dollars more, roughly; is that
02:43:50PM 2	Q. Okay. So sitting here today you don't know how, for	02:47:53PM 2	correct?
02:43:53PM 3	example, your model would have been impacted had you used all of	02:47:53PM 3	A. Yes.
02:43:58PM 4	the available disbursement data rather than simply plugging in	02:47:54PM 4	Q. And then 2005, since you have the numbers right in front of
02:44:03PM 5	the seventy percent calculation?	02:47:58PM 5	you, what's the difference there?
02:44:05PM 6	A. No. I'd have to go back and carefully get that data and	02:48:00PM 6	A. We're comparing 202.7 with 278.4.
02:44:09PM 7	substitute it.	02:48:06PM 7	Q. So again, about 75 million?
02:44:10PM 8	Q. Did you ever review any audited figures related to the	02:48:08PM 8	A. Yes.
02:44:15PM 9	individual Indian money accounts?	02:48:10PM 9	Q. In retrospect, do you think it would have been more
02:44:17PM 10	A. When you say "audited," I mean, they aren't a private	02:48:15PM 10	reasonable to use audited disbursement figures in your analysis
02:44:23PM 11	company so I don't really quite know what you mean by "audited."	02:48:20PM 11	than the seventy percent that you imputed for those two years?
02:44:28PM 12	Q. I'm actually referring to the audit of the IIM system.	02:48:23PM 12	A. I don't think even in retrospect that as a financial
02:44:35PM 13	Why don't we go ahead and pull up for example	02:48:29PM 13	economist I'm in the position to do the detailed trust
02:44:38PM 14	Defendants' Exhibit 438.	02:48:33PM 14	accounting. I can develop a model, which I have done, but I'm
02:44:55PM 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, would you like a copy of	02:48:40PM 15	going to need help from the Court and from both parties to make
02:44:57PM 16	that?	02:48:46PM 16	sure that the most accurate figures go in there.
02:44:57PM 17	THE COURT: No.	02:48:48PM 17	Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me ask you another question. Why
02:44:58PM 18	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	02:48:55PM 18	don't we go, we're looking again at Attachment A, and you can go
02:44:58PM 19	Q. Professor Cornell, I've placed before you what we've had	02:49:00PM 19	to the first page if you'd like so we don't have all these
02:45:21PM 20	marked as Defendants' Exhibit 438. This actually was also part	02:49:05PM 20	footnotes in front of us. Now, again, assume, remember we
02:45:26PM 21	of the administative record from our prior hearing, but it's	02:49:25PM 21	talked earlier about Osage and I asked you to assume that
02:45:32PM 22	captioned Independent Auditors' Report of the Tribal and Other	02:49:29PM 22	payments were made directly from well, strike that.
02:45:35PM 23	Trust Funds and Individual Indian Monies Trust Funds, and this	02:49:35PM 23	Your total revenues figure?
02:45:40PM 24	is for the fiscal years 2006 and 2005. Have you ever seen a	02:49:38PM 24	A. Corrected revenue is actually the word I use.
02:45:44PM 25	document like this before?	02:49:40PM 25	Q. I'm sorry, yes. Right. Your corrected revenue figures,
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	·		·
1	345	1	347
02:45:45PM 1	345 A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar.	02:49:45PM 1	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts
02:45:58PM 2	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why	02:49:56PM 2	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right?
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:06PM 3	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes.
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:06PM 3 02:46:08PM 4	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom?	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:58PM 4	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:06PM 3 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:58PM 4 02:50:18PM 5	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F,
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:06PM 3 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:15PM 6	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen.	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-27PM 6	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under
02-45-58PM 2 02-46-06PM 3 02-46-08PM 4 02-46-11PM 5 02-46-15PM 6	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it.	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-58PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-27PM 6	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model?
02:46:58PM 2 02:46:06PM 3 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:15PM 6 02:46:17PM 7	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it.	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:56PM 4 02:50:18PM 5 02:50:27PM 6 02:50:37PM 7	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model?
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:08PM 3 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:15PM 6 02:46:15PM 7 02:46:15PM 8	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:58PM 4 02:50:18PM 5 02:50:27PM 6 02:50:33PM 7 02:50:33PM 8	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:11PM 6 02:46:15PM 6 02:46:15PM 8 02:46:28PM 9	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-58PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-37PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 8 02-50-37PM 9	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:18PM 5 02:46:18PM 6 02:46:17PM 7 02:46:18PM 8 02:46:22PM 9 02:46:30PM 10	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:56PM 4 02:50:18PM 5 02:50:27PM 6 02:50:33PM 7 02:50:33PM 8 02:50:47PM 9 02:50:47PM 10	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would.
02-45-58PM 2 02-46-08PM 4 02-46-11PM 5 02-46-11PM 6 02-46-13PM 7 02-46-13PM 8 02-46-22PM 9 02-46-30PM 10 02-46-33PM 11	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir?	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:58PM 4 02:50:18PM 5 02:50:27PM 6 02:50:33PM 7 02:50:33PM 8 02:50:37PM 9 02:50:51PM 10 02:50:52PM 11	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here.
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:18PM 5 02:46:18PM 6 02:46:18PM 8 02:46:28PM 9 02:46:38PM 10 02:46:38PM 11 02:46:38PM 12	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes.	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-38PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 8 02-50-34PM 10 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-56PM 12	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor.
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:11PM 6 02:46:13PM 8 02:46:12PM 9 02:46:32PM 10 02:46:33PM 11 02:46:38PM 12 02:46:33PM 13	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 8 02-50-47PM 9 02-50-51PM 10 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-53PM 12 02-51-50PM 13	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:15PM 6 02:46:15PM 8 02:46:15PM 8 02:46:25PM 10 02:46:35PM 11 02:46:35PM 12 02:46:35PM 13 02:46:35PM 13	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for	02:49:56PM 2 02:49:56PM 3 02:49:58PM 4 02:50:18PM 5 02:50:33PM 6 02:50:33PM 8 02:50:33PM 10 02:50:51PM 10 02:50:52PM 11 02:50:52PM 12 02:51:50PM 13 02:51:50PM 13	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:11PM 6 02:46:13PM 8 02:46:13PM 9 02:46:32PM 10 02:46:33PM 11 02:46:33PM 13 02:46:33PM 13 02:46:34PM 14 02:46:34PM 15 02:46:58PM 16 02:46:58PM 17	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that?	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-38PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 9 02-50-34PM 10 02-50-56PM 11 02-50-56PM 12 02-51-56PM 13 02-51-56PM 14 02-51-56PM 14	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from
02-45-58PM 2 02-46-08PM 4 02-46-11PM 5 02-46-11PM 5 02-46-13PM 8 02-46-13PM 8 02-46-32PM 10 02-46-33PM 11 02-46-33PM 12 02-46-33PM 14 02-46-34PM 15 02-46-34PM 15 02-46-34PM 16 02-46-54PM 16 02-46-54PM 17 02-47-05PM 18	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes.	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-27PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 10 02-50-32PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-00PM 13 02-51-00PM 14 02-51-15PM 15 02-51-15PM 16 02-51-15PM 16 02-51-15PM 17	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right?
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:18PM 5 02:46:18PM 6 02:46:18PM 8 02:46:38PM 10 02:46:38PM 11 02:46:38PM 12 02:46:38PM 15 02:46:38PM 15 02:46:38PM 15 02:46:58PM 16 02:46:58PM 17 02:46:58PM 17 02:47:50PM 18 02:47:50PM 19	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 9 02-50-37PM 10 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-52PM 13 02-51-52PM 14 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-21PM 17 02-51-21PM 18	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes.
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:1PM 5 02:46:1PM 6 02:46:1PM 7 02:46:1PM 9 02:46:3PM 10 02:46:3PM 11 02:46:3PM 12 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 16 02:46:3PM 17 02:46:58PM 16 02:46:58PM 17 02:47:50PM 18 02:47:50PM 19 02:47:50PM 20	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A?	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 9 02-50-31PM 10 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 17 02-51-21PM 18 02-51-27PM 19 02-51-32PM 20	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury.
02-45-58PM 2 02-46-08PM 4 02-46-18PM 5 02-46-18PM 6 02-46-18PM 9 02-46-18PM 10 02-46-38PM 11 02-46-38PM 12 02-46-38PM 13 02-46-38PM 15 02-46-38PM 15 02-46-58PM 16 02-46-58PM 17 02-47-08PM 18 02-47-08PM 20 02-47-08PM 20 02-47-08PM 21	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A? A. Well, we'd have to go back and look. Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment A, the last page, and you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 10 02-50-33PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-10PM 13 02-51-10PM 15 02-51-10PM 16 02-51-10PM 17 02-51-10PM 18 02-51-27PM 18 02-51-27PM 19 02-51-33PM 20 02-51-33PM 20	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the
02-45-58PM 2 02-46-58PM 4 02-46-18PM 5 02-46-18PM 6 02-46-18PM 8 02-46-18PM 10 02-46-18PM 11 02-46-38PM 12 02-46-38PM 13 02-46-38PM 15 02-46-38PM 15 02-46-38PM 15 02-46-58PM 15 02-46-58PM 15 02-46-58PM 16 02-46-58PM 17 02-47-50PM 18 02-47-50PM 18 02-47-50PM 19 02-47-50PM 20 02-47-58PM 21	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A? A. Well, we'd have to go back and look. Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment A, the last page, and you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for 2006 your disbursements figure was how much?	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 9 02-50-33PM 10 02-50-32PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-52PM 15 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 17 02-51-21PM 18 02-51-22PM 18 02-51-32PM 20 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury. Q. Okay. And I'm looking at Attachment C now. Your Attachment C which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, sorry, you had
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:1PM 5 02:46:1PM 6 02:46:1PM 8 02:46:3PM 10 02:46:3PM 11 02:46:3PM 12 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 16 02:46:3PM 17 02:46:58PM 16 02:46:58PM 17 02:47:0PM 19 02:47:0PM 19 02:47:0PM 20 02:47:0PM 21 02:47:0PM 21 02:47:0PM 22	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A? A. Well, we'd have to go back and look. Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment A, the last page, and you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for 2006 your disbursements figure was how much? A. 271.1 million.	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 10 02-50-33PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-52PM 14 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 17 02-51-21PM 18 02-51-22PM 19 02-51-33PM 20 02-51-33PM 20 02-51-33PM 21	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury. Q. Okay. And I'm looking at Attachment C now. Your Attachment C which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, sorry, you had your footnote two I'm sorry. Attachment A, Column E, so is
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:1PM 5 02:46:1PM 6 02:46:1PM 7 02:46:1PM 9 02:46:3PM 10 02:46:3PM 11 02:46:3PM 12 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 16 02:46:3PM 17 02:46:3PM 18 02:47:5PM 20 02:47:5PM 20 02:47:5PM 20 02:47:5PM 20 02:47:5PM 22 02:47:3PM 23 02:47:3PM 23	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A? A. Well, we'd have to go back and look. Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment A, the last page, and you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for 2006 your disbursements figure was how much? A. 271.1 million. Q. And what was it in the audited report?	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 9 02-50-37PM 10 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 17 02-51-21PM 18 02-51-23PM 20 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-34PM 22 02-51-34PM 23 02-52-02PM 24	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury. Q. Okay. And I'm looking at Attachment C now. Your Attachment C which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, sorry, you had your footnote two I'm sorry. Attachment A, Column E, so is it fair to say that to the extent disbursements were made to
02:45:58PM 2 02:46:58PM 4 02:46:1PM 5 02:46:1PM 6 02:46:1PM 8 02:46:3PM 10 02:46:3PM 11 02:46:3PM 12 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 15 02:46:3PM 16 02:46:3PM 17 02:46:58PM 16 02:46:58PM 17 02:47:0PM 19 02:47:0PM 19 02:47:0PM 20 02:47:0PM 21 02:47:0PM 21 02:47:0PM 22	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A? A. Well, we'd have to go back and look. Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment A, the last page, and you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for 2006 your disbursements figure was how much? A. 271.1 million. Q. And what was it in the audited report? A. It appears to be the 374.5 million.	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 10 02-50-33PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-52PM 14 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 17 02-51-21PM 18 02-51-22PM 19 02-51-33PM 20 02-51-33PM 20 02-51-33PM 21	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury. Q. Okay. And I'm looking at Attachment C now. Your Attachment C which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, sorry, you had your footnote two I'm sorry. Attachment A, Column E, so is it fair to say that to the extent disbursements were made to headright owners, that would you're assuming it's encompassed
02:46:58PM 2 02:46:08PM 4 02:46:11PM 5 02:46:11PM 6 02:46:13PM 7 02:46:13PM 8 02:46:22PM 9 02:46:32PM 10 02:46:33PM 11 02:46:33PM 12 02:46:33PM 14 02:46:38PM 15 02:46:38PM 15 02:46:58PM 16 02:46:58PM 17 02:46:58PM 17 02:47:01PM 18 02:47:01PM 19 02:47:04PM 20 02:47:04PM 21 02:47:33PM 21	A. It looks familiar, but not precisely familiar. Q. Okay. Well, let's go to page 24 of this document. Why don't you blow up A. How are the pages Bates number 24 on the bottom? Q. I'm sorry. Right in the lower right-hand corner, or if you want you can actually look on the screen. A. I'm pulling it up here as well. I've got it. Q. And I have pulled up a statement of changes in trust fund balances for the years ended September 30th, 2006 and 2005. And as you'll see from the top of this, this is with respect to the individual Indian monies trust funds. Do you see that, sir? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And if you look on, there's a line there under Decreases, disbursements to and on behalf of accountholders for 2006, 3.74.5 million; for 2005, 278.4 million. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And what numbers did you use for disbursements in Attachment A? A. Well, we'd have to go back and look. Q. Would you mind pulling up Attachment A, the last page, and you can compare it to the hard copy there. So, for example, for 2006 your disbursements figure was how much? A. 271.1 million. Q. And what was it in the audited report?	02-49-56PM 2 02-49-56PM 3 02-49-56PM 4 02-50-18PM 5 02-50-18PM 6 02-50-33PM 7 02-50-33PM 9 02-50-37PM 10 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 11 02-50-52PM 12 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 15 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 16 02-51-16PM 17 02-51-21PM 18 02-51-23PM 20 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-33PM 21 02-51-34PM 22 02-51-34PM 23 02-52-02PM 24	that includes all of the Osage payments, all the amounts collected by Osage, right? A. All the ones reported on their website, yes. Q. I'd like you to let's see. I'm sorry. Bear with me a moment. If we can go to the disbursement figure in Column F, does that include disbursements to Osage headright owners under your model? A. I'm hesitating because I don't have the I've testified before that, you know, the checks, it would be my understanding I think that it would. Q. Okay. Let me see something here. So bear with me, your Honor. I just want to compare this, the Attachment C that we had, to the current one. Okay. Why don't we now, the disbursements data, again, you've explained that that came from the CPNR data, right? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what CPNR is? A. Check reconciliation and payment accounting produced by the Treasury. Q. Okay. And I'm looking at Attachment C now. Your Attachment C which is Plaintiffs' Exhibit 56, sorry, you had your footnote two I'm sorry. Attachment A, Column E, so is it fair to say that to the extent disbursements were made to

	348		350
02:52:15PM 1	within the CPNR data, correct?	02:55:31PM 1	Professor Cornell, you recall we were reviewing a number of
02:52:18PM 2	A. Yes.	02:55:36PM 2	these commissioner Indian affairs reports earlier today,
02:52:18PM 3	Q. Okay.	02:55:42PM 3	specifically Plaintiffs' Exhibit 45 to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 50
02:52:19PM 4	A. I'm assuming that the Osage money went into the general IIM	02:55:45PM 4	related to the years 1915 to 1920?
02:52:25PM 5	account and then would be paid out, so it would be included in	02:55:49PM 5	A. Yes, I remember that.
02:52:28PM 6	both the revenues and the disbursements.	02:55:50PM 6	Q. And if you recall talking about how you utilized the total
02:52:30PM 7	Q. Are you familiar with, have you ever heard about something	02:55:54PM 7	income figures on the right-hand side?
02:52:33PM 8	like something called Treasury disbursing symbol 4844?	02:55:57PM 8	A. Correct.
02:52:38PM 9	A. Yes.	02:55:57PM 9	Q. And I'm sorry, I should have actually we're going to
02:52:39PM 10	Q. And what is your understanding of what that is?	02:56:01PM 10	have to bring it down a little bit so you can see the years, and
02:52:41PM 11	A. That that's an account number related to the individual	02:56:05PM 11	you can see over on the left-hand side the first year is 1920
02:52:45PM 12	Indian trust.	02:56:09PM 12	and then there's 1919, 1918 on down like that. Do you see that?
02:52:48PM 13	Q. Okay. And the CPNR data that is utilized, was that simply	02:56:12PM 13	A. Yes.
02:52:54PM 14	for 4844?	02:56:13PM 14	Q. Now, let's go back to where I was before under the last
02:52:55PM 15	A. That's my understanding, yes.	02:56:17PM 15	caption. Do you see there are two categories, allotted and
02:52:57PM 16	Q. So if in fact the payments made to headright owners go	02:56:23PM 16	unallotted?
02:53:06PM 17	through a different Treasury disbursing symbol, your	02:56:23PM 17	A. Yes.
02:53:10PM 18	disbursements data wouldn't capture that; is that correct?	02:56:26PM 18	Q. Do you have an understanding as to the distinction between
02:53:13PM 19	A. I believe that's correct.	02:56:30PM 19	those two categories?
02:53:14PM 20	Q. Are you familiar with the terms, and they both refer to	02:56:30PM 20	A. I think I did when we originally went through this. I
02:53:20PM 21	basically the same thing, ACH, EFT, the acronyms?	02:56:35PM 21	don't recall it now.
02:53:26PM 22	A. Electronic funds transfer.	02:56:35PM 22	Q. Let me see. Would it refresh your recollection if I were
02:53:29PM 23	Q. Exactly, or ACH, automated clearing house?	02:56:43PM 23	to suggest that the unallotted referred to tribal trust as
02:53:33PM 24	A. Yes, I'm familiar with those.	02:56:51PM 24	opposed to individual trust, individual Indian trust, does that
02:53:34PM 25	Q. Okay. And are you a have you been made aware whether	02:56:54PM 25	sound familiar?
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	349		351
02:53:39PM 1	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian	02:56:55PM 1	A. That might be right, but I'm not sure.
02:53:39PM 1 02:53:45PM 2		02:56:55PM 1 02:56:57PM 2	
_	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks?	_	A. That might be right, but I'm not sure.
02:53:45PM 2	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks,	02:56:57PM 2	A. That might be right, but I'm not sure.Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:56PM 5	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks?	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:08PM 4 02:57:14PM 5	A. That might be right, but I'm not sure.Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:49PM 3 02:53:50PM 4	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6	A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues?
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:49PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:59PM 6 02:54:03PM 7	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed.	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:02PM 4 02:57:08PM 5 02:57:18PM 6 02:57:18PM 7	A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:56PM 5 02:53:56PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:05PM 8	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:08PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:18PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:25PM 8	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:56PM 4 02:53:56PM 5 02:53:56PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 8 02:54:12PM 9	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH?	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 8 02:57:23PM 9	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:05PM 8 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:17PM 10	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:02PM 4 02:57:08PM 5 02:57:18PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 8 02:57:23PM 9 02:57:32PM 10	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:56PM 5 02:53:56PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 8 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:17PM 10 02:54:23PM 11	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:08PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 8 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:33PM 11	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated.
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 9 02:54:17PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:25PM 12	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation.	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:08PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 9 02:57:32PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:35PM 11	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM?
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 7 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 8 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:12PM 10 02:54:25PM 11 02:54:25PM 11 02:54:25PM 13	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 9 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:35PM 11 02:57:35PM 12 02:57:35PM 13	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes.
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:56PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:05PM 8 02:54:05PM 10 02:54:25PM 11 02:54:25PM 12 02:54:30PM 13 02:54:30PM 13	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:08PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 8 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:32PM 12 02:57:32PM 12 02:57:32PM 13	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 8 02:54:17PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 12 02:54:34PM 13 02:54:34PM 14 02:54:34PM 15	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments?	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:08PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 9 02:57:32PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:35PM 12 02:57:42PM 13 02:57:42PM 14 02:57:46PM 15	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:59PM 6 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 9 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:12PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 12 02:54:39PM 14 02:54:39PM 15 02:54:39PM 16	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No.	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 9 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:34PM 13 02:57:42PM 14 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:44PM 15	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection.
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 9 02:54:12PM 10 02:54:25PM 11 02:54:25PM 12 02:54:30PM 13 02:54:30PM 14 02:54:39PM 15 02:54:30PM 15	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic	02.56.57PM 2 02.57.02PM 3 02.57.03PM 4 02.57.14PM 5 02.57.14PM 6 02.57.23PM 7 02.57.23PM 10 02.57.23PM 11 02.57.33PM 12 02.57.32PM 13 02.57.42PM 14 02.57.42PM 15 02.57.53PM 15 02.57.53PM 16 02.57.53PM 17	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes.
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 13 02:54:34PM 14 02:54:34PM 15 02:54:34PM 15 02:54:34PM 16 02:54:34PM 17 02:54:34PM 17	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:32PM 12 02:57:32PM 13 02:57:42PM 13 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:56PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:05PM 9 02:54:17PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:25PM 12 02:54:34PM 14 02:54:34PM 15 02:54:35PM 16 02:54:35PM 17 02:54:35PM 17 02:54:35PM 18 02:54:35PM 18	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low?	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 9 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:33PM 11 02:57:34PM 12 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:34PM 16 02:57:34PM 17 02:58:04PM 18	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please?
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 9 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:12PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 12 02:54:30PM 13 02:54:34PM 14 02:54:35PM 16 02:54:35PM 16 02:54:35PM 17 02:54:35PM 18 02:54:35PM 19 02:54:50PM 19	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:33PM 14 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:43PM 16 02:57:43PM 17 02:58:04PM 19 02:58:04PM 19	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:53:50PM 7 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 10 02:54:12PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:30PM 13 02:54:30PM 15 02:54:30PM 16 02:54:30PM 17 02:54:30PM 18 02:54:30PM 19 02:54:30PM 19 02:54:30PM 19	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:23PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:32PM 13 02:57:42PM 14 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:59PM 16 02:57:59PM 17 02:58:04PM 19 02:58:04PM 20 02:58:04PM 20	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of this year. We're going to go specifically to, the citation is
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 9 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:12PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 12 02:54:30PM 13 02:54:34PM 14 02:54:35PM 16 02:54:35PM 16 02:54:35PM 17 02:54:35PM 18 02:54:35PM 19 02:54:50PM 19	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and understood it, but I couldn't rule out that possibility.	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:33PM 14 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:42PM 15 02:57:43PM 16 02:57:43PM 17 02:58:04PM 19 02:58:04PM 19	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:03PM 7 02:54:03PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 13 02:54:34PM 14 02:54:34PM 15 02:54:34PM 16 02:54:35PM 17 02:54:35PM 18 02:54:50PM 19 02:54:53PM 20 02:54:53PM 20 02:54:53PM 21	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:32PM 12 02:57:32PM 15 02:57:32PM 15 02:57:32PM 17 02:58:01PM 18 02:58:01PM 18 02:58:04PM 20 02:58:13PM 21 02:58:13PM 21	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of this year. We're going to go specifically to, the citation is 532 F Supp 2d at page 84. So go to the 41st page of this
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 10 02:54:17PM 10 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 14 02:54:30PM 15 02:54:30PM 15 02:54:30PM 17 02:54:30PM 17 02:54:30PM 19 02:54:50PM 19 02:54:50PM 20 02:54:50PM 21	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and understood it, but I couldn't rule out that possibility. Q. I'd like to refer to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 50. If you could	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:32PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:33PM 14 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:35PM 16 02:57:35PM 17 02:57:36PM 17 02:58:04PM 19 02:58:04PM 20 02:58:04PM 21 02:58:04PM 21	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of this year. We're going to go specifically to, the citation is 532 F Supp 2d at page 84. So go to the 41st page of this document.
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 10 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:12PM 11 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 14 02:54:30PM 15 02:54:30PM 16 02:54:30PM 17 02:54:30PM 18 02:54:30PM 19 02:54:50PM 20 02:54:50PM 21 02:54:50PM 21 02:54:50PM 21 02:55:07PM 23 02:55:07PM 23	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and understood it, but I couldn't rule out that possibility. Q. I'd like to refer to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 50. If you could pull that up, please. And I'll tell you what. I'm going to try	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:23PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:33PM 14 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:35PM 16 02:57:35PM 16 02:57:35PM 17 02:58:04PM 19 02:58:04PM 20 02:58:36PM 21 02:58:36PM 22 02:58:36PM 23	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of this year. We're going to go specifically to, the citation is 532 F Supp 2d at page 84. So go to the 41st page of this document. And would you blow up the yellow section here? Blow
02:53:45PM 2 02:53:45PM 3 02:53:50PM 4 02:53:50PM 5 02:53:50PM 6 02:54:05PM 7 02:54:05PM 10 02:54:12PM 9 02:54:12PM 11 02:54:23PM 11 02:54:23PM 14 02:54:30PM 15 02:54:30PM 16 02:54:30PM 17 02:54:30PM 18 02:54:30PM 19 02:54:50PM 20 02:54:50PM 21 02:54:50PM 21 02:54:50PM 21 02:55:07PM 23 02:55:07PM 23	any disbursements from the Indian to the individual Indian beneficiaries are made electronically as opposed to by checks, being made by checks? A. Well, you can make it electronically and still have a, quote, check number. You get a nonnegotiable check. That's the way CRA pays me, for example, but I'm not aware of the details of how these are distributed. Q. Well, do you know whether the CPNR data includes payments made by EFT or ACH? A. I interpreted it to be all payments made out of 4844, so if some of those were electronic I would think it would include the electronic. That would have been my interpretation. Q. Have you ever heard of a system called PACER with respect not the judicial one, but with respect to electronic payments? A. No. Q. So if in fact the CPNR data did not include the electronic transfers that we've been talking about, would you agree with me that your disbursement rate is artificially low? A. It might be. I would have to understand, I don't want to draw a conclusion until I've looked at the actual data and understood it, but I couldn't rule out that possibility. Q. I'd like to refer to Plaintiffs' Exhibit 50. If you could pull that up, please. And I'll tell you what. I'm going to try to make this easier. If I can step over here and show	02:56:57PM 2 02:57:02PM 3 02:57:03PM 4 02:57:14PM 5 02:57:14PM 6 02:57:23PM 7 02:57:23PM 10 02:57:23PM 11 02:57:33PM 12 02:57:33PM 14 02:57:34PM 15 02:57:35PM 16 02:57:35PM 16 02:57:35PM 17 02:58:04PM 19 02:58:04PM 20 02:58:36PM 21 02:58:36PM 22 02:58:36PM 23	 A. That might be right, but I'm not sure. Q. Well, I don't want you to guess here. Suffice it to say if in fact the unallotted amounts should not have been included as income for the individual Indian monies trust accounts, is it fair to say that your revenue figures have been overstated to the extent you've utilized unallotted revenues? A. I think that follows by definition from your assumptions. I'm trying to get out the total receipts into the individual Indian trust, and if there is a number that was included in that, it was not a receipt for that trust, it would indeed be overstated. Q. Have you ever heard the expression tribal IIM? A. Yes. Q. And what is your understanding of what tribal IIM referred to? You know, it's been a long day. Let me see if we can refresh your recollection. A. I'm trying to remember, yes. Q. This might help. You stated very eloquently would you pull up Cobell 20, please? This is Judge Robertson's opinion from January 30th of this year. We're going to go specifically to, the citation is 532 F Supp 2d at page 84. So go to the 41st page of this document. And would you blow up the yellow section here? Blow it up a little bit more. It's been a long day. Okay.

	352		354
02:58:45PM 1	Can you see the highlighted section where Judge	03:02:16PM 1	Q. Have you become aware of instances strike that actually.
02:58:49PM 2	Robertson was discussing tribal IIM accounts and tribal IIM	03:02:24PM 2	Are you aware that some of the amounts collected
02:58:54PM 3	money, and he states, Tribes utilized IIM accounts as	03:02:28PM 3	within the IIM system represented deposits made by unsuccessful
02:59:01PM 4	convenience as a realitively easy way to obtain checks from the	03:02:37PM 4	bidders?
02:59:06PM 5	IIM system. Such accounts oxymoronically are referred to as	03:02:38PM 5	A. Yes.
02:59:11PM 6	tribal IIM accounts containing tribal IIM money, and citing to	03:02:39PM 6	Q. Okay. And for example, why don't we go ahead and let's
02:59:17PM 7	Kathy Ramirez's testimony. Does that refresh your recollection	03:02:45PM 7	go to Defendants' Exhibit 33. This is actually, I believe this
02:59:26PM 8	as to what tribal IIM money is?	03:02:55PM 8	is actually I believe this is from one of the same reports
02:59:28PM 9	A. I think so, and if I read above it, it refreshes me better	03:03:01PM 9	you looked at earlier with Mr. Gingold, but why don't we go to
02:59:34PM 10	that tribal IIM money is money owned by or the tribal unit has	03:03:09PM 10	page two, and if you look in the upper right-hand corner you see
02:59:43PM 11	the right to that gets deposited into the IIM account.	03:03:16PM 11	there's under disbursement amounts returned to unsuccessful
02:59:46PM 12	Q. How does Attachment A treat tribal IIM money?	03:03:21PM 12	bidders, do you see that?
02:59:51PM 13	A. It doesn't break it out.	03:03:23PM 13	A. Yes.
02:59:57PM 14	Q. And so for example, to the extent you've included	03:03:23PM 14	Q. And that represented in that particular year about a third
03:00:04PM 15	collections within your collections figure tribal IIM money,	03:03:28PM 15	of the disbursements?
03:00:07РМ 16	that overstates revenues; is that correct?	03:03:32PM 16	A. Yes.
03:00:09PM 17	A. That sounds correct, but again, sitting here under oath I	03:03:33PM 17	Q. That's very rough, but 2.7 million out of 7.6, 7.7 million,
03:00:19PM 18	wouldn't want to say for sure.	03:03:39PM 18	right?
03:00:20PM 19	Q. Okay. Did you ever become aware of circumstances where	03:03:39РМ 19	A. Yes.
03:00:26PM 20	revenues into the IIM system include amounts that subsequently	03:03:39PM 20	Q. And how does your model treat disbursements and collections
03:00:30PM 21	were transferred to the tribal trust?	03:03:46PM 21	related to unsuccessful bids?
03:00:36PM 22	A. I became aware of instances of that, yes.	03:03:49PM 22	A. Unsuccessful bids, because it would not if they were
03:00:40PM 23	Q. And how did those how were those transfers accomplished?	03:03:54PM 23	earnedd it would not accrew as a benefit to the government and
03:00:45PM 24	I mean, in other words, mechanically? Was a journal entry	03:03:58PM 24	should be debunked out.
03:00:49PM 25	prepared?	03:04:00PM 25	Q. That's happened in your days?
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	353		355
03:00:49PM 1	A. I don't know.	03:04:03PM 1	A. Well, it's hard to say, because with just applying the
03:00:51PM 2	Q. Well, let's take a look at, I had this marked as	2	
03:00:55РМ 3		03:04:08PM 2	thity, it isn't clear exactly what's in that thirty percent.
03:00:55PM 3	Defendants' Exhibit 480. This is actually a much larger	03:04:08PM 2 03:04:14PM 3	thity, it isn't clear exactly what's in that thirty percent. Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and
03:00:55PM 3	Defendants' Exhibit 480. This is actually a much larger exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if		
4		03:04:14PM 3	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and
03:01:00PM 4	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if	03:04:14PM 3 03:04:21PM 4	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:03PM 5	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And	03:04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:03PM 5 03:01:17PM 6	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a	03:04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last
03:01:00PM	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before?	03:04:14PM 3 03:04:21PM 4 03:04:25PM 5 03:04:35PM 6 03:04:35PM 7	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent
03:01:00PM	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so.	03:04:14PM 3 03:04:21PM 4 03:04:25PM 5 03:04:35PM 6 03:04:35PM 7 03:04:41PM 8	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:03PM 5 03:01:17PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 8 03:01:25PM 9	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to	03.04-14PM 4 03.04-25PM 5 03.04-25PM 6 03.04-35PM 7 03.04-35PM 7 03.04-41PM 8 03.04-47PM 9	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:00PM 5 03:01:17PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 8 03:01:25PM 9 03:01:34PM 10	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039?	03:04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know?
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:03PM 5 03:01:17PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 8 03:01:25PM 9 03:01:34PM 10 03:01:35PM 11	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes.	03:04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of
03.01.00PM 4 03.01.03PM 5 03.01.17PM 6 03.0125PM 7 03.0125PM 9 03.0134PM 10 03.0135PM 11 03.0135PM 12	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is?	03.04-14PM 4 03.04-25PM 5 03.04-25PM 6 03.04-35PM 7 03.04-35PM 7 03.04-47PM 9 03.04-56PM 10 03.04-56PM 11	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:00PM 5 03:01:17PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 8 03:01:25PM 10 03:01:35PM 11 03:01:35PM 12 03:01:35PM 12	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No.	03:04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the micro-
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:00PM 5 03:01:37PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 9 03:01:34PM 10 03:01:34PM 11 03:01:34PM 12 03:01:34PM 13 03:01:34PM 13 03:01:34PM 14	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't	03:04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata.
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:00PM 5 03:01:01PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 9 03:01:34PM 10 03:01:35PM 11 03:01:35PM 12 03:01:35PM 13 03:01:35PM 14 03:01:35PM 14	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is?	03.04-14PM 4 03.04-25PM 5 03.04-25PM 6 03.04-35PM 7 03.04-35PM 9 03.04-47PM 9 03.04-56PM 11 03.04-56PM 12 03.05-10PM 13 03.05-10PM 14	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
03.01.00PM 4 03.01.03PM 5 03.01.17PM 6 03.01.25PM 7 03.01.25PM 8 03.01.25PM 10 03.01.35PM 11 03.01.35PM 12 03.01.35PM 13 03.01.35PM 14 03.01.35PM 15 03.01.35PM 15 03.01.35PM 15	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so.	03:04:14PM 4 03:04:25PM 5 03:04:25PM 6 03:04:35PM 7 03:04:41PM 8 03:04:47PM 9 03:04:52PM 10 03:04:56PM 11 03:04:56PM 12 03:05:04PM 13 03:05:10PM 14 03:05:10PM 15	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent
0301-05PM 4 0301-05PM 5 0301-17PM 6 0301-25PM 7 0301-25PM 9 0301-35PM 10 0301-35PM 11 0301-35PM 12 0301-35PM 13 0301-35PM 14 0301-35PM 15 0301-45PM 15 0301-45PM 15	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being	03:04:14PM	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion
03.01.00PM 4 03.01.03PM 5 03.01.17PM 6 03.01.25PM 7 03.01.25PM 9 03.01.34PM 10 03.01.35PM 11 03.01.35PM 12 03.01.35PM 14 03.01.35PM 14 03.01.35PM 15 03.01.45PM 16 03.01.47PM 17 03.01.51PM 17	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts?	03.04:14PM	Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent disbursement does not include money that was returned to unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you?
03:01:00PM 4 03:01:00PM 5 03:01:00PM 6 03:01:25PM 7 03:01:25PM 9 03:01:34PM 10 03:01:35PM 11 03:01:35PM 12 03:01:35PM 14 03:01:35PM 15 03:01:35PM 15 03:01:35PM 17 03:01:35PM 18 03:01:35PM 18 03:01:35PM 19	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no.	03.04:14PM	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent disbursement does not include money that was returned to unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you? A. I'm off by whatever the return to the unsuccessful bidders.
0301-00PM 4 0301-00PM 5 0301-17PM 6 0301-25PM 7 0301-25PM 8 0301-25PM 10 0301-35PM 11 0301-35PM 12 0301-35PM 13 0301-35PM 15 0301-45PM 15 0301-45PM 16 0301-45PM 17 0301-54PM 19 0301-54PM 19 0301-54PM 20	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no. Q. If that's what this is, though, am I correct that your	03:04:14PM 4 03:04:25PM 5 03:04:25PM 6 03:04:35PM 7 03:04:35PM 8 03:04:47PM 9 03:04:52PM 10 03:04:52PM 11 03:04:52PM 12 03:05:04PM 13 03:05:10PM 14 03:05:10PM 15 03:05:15PM 17 03:05:21PM 18 03:05:26PM 19 03:05:26PM 20	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion
0301-05PM 4 0301-05PM 5 0301-17PM 6 0301-25PM 7 0301-25PM 9 0301-35PM 10 0301-35PM 12 0301-35PM 14 0301-35PM 15 0301-35PM 15 0301-35PM 17 0301-35PM 17 0301-35PM 18 0301-35PM 19 0301-55PM 19 0301-55PM 20 030201PM 21	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no. Q. If that's what this is, though, am I correct that your disbursement calculation wouldn't have captured such a transfer	03:04:14PM	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent disbursement does not include money that was returned to unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you? A. I'm off by whatever the return to the unsuccessful bidders. THE COURT: If it were a third, as in this case, it would wipe out the delta.
0301-00PM 4 0301-00PM 5 0301-17PM 6 0301-12PPM 7 0301-25PM 10 0301-34PM 10 0301-34PM 12 0301-35PM 13 0301-35PM 14 0301-35PM 15 0301-47PM 16 0301-47PM 17 0301-54PM 18 0301-54PM 19 0301-54PM 20 0302-01PM 21 0302-05PM 22	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no. Q. If that's what this is, though, am I correct that your disbursement calculation wouldn't have captured such a transfer because this wouldn't have been something included in the CPNR	03.04:14PM	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent disbursement does not include money that was returned to unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you? A. I'm off by whatever the return to the unsuccessful bidders. THE COURT: If it were a third, as in this case, it would wipe out the delta. THE WITNESS: Well, that's a third of the
0301-00PM 4 0301-00PM 5 0301-17PM 6 0301-25PM 7 0301-25PM 8 0301-25PM 10 0301-35PM 11 0301-35PM 12 0301-35PM 15 0301-35PM 15 0301-35PM 16 0301-35PM 17 0301-35PM 18 0301-35PM 19 0301-35PM 20 0302-05PM 21 0302-05PM 22	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no. Q. If that's what this is, though, am I correct that your disbursement calculation wouldn't have captured such a transfer because this wouldn't have been something included in the CPNR data?	03:04:14PM	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent disbursement does not include money that was returned to unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you? A. I'm off by whatever the return to the unsuccessful bidders. THE COURT: If it were a third, as in this case, it would wipe out the delta. THE WITNESS: Well, that's a third of the disbursements, not a third of the revenues, but it would take a
G301-00PM 4 G301-00PM 5 G301-17PM 6 G301-25PM 7 G301-25PM 9 G301-25PM 10 G301-35PM 11 G301-35PM 12 G301-35PM 15 G301-35PM 15 G301-35PM 15 G301-35PM 16 G301-35PM 17 G301-35PM 17 G301-35PM 19 G301-35PM 20 G302-05PM 21 G302-05PM 22 G302-05PM 23 G302-15PM 24 G302-05PM 24	exhibit. We're just going to go to the last page, page nine, if you can pull that up, please. Page nine, the last page. And why don't you focus on the top half first. Have you ever seen a document like this before? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. Okay. And you see on the left-hand side a reference to 14X63039? A. Yes. Q. Do you know what that is? A. No. Q. And over on the right-hand side obviously then you wouldn't know what the 14X7433 and on down is? A. No, I don't believe so. Q. So you don't know whether this represents money being transferred from the IIM account to the tribal trust accounts? A. I couldn't testify that I do today, no. Q. If that's what this is, though, am I correct that your disbursement calculation wouldn't have captured such a transfer because this wouldn't have been something included in the CPNR data? A. I believe that's correct, but I'd have to understand it	03:04:14PM 3 03:04:25PM 4 03:04:25PM 5 03:04:32PM 6 03:04:32PM 8 03:04:32PM 9 03:04:47PM 9 03:04:52PM 10 03:04:52PM 11 03:04:56PM 12 03:05:10PM 15 03:05:10PM 15 03:05:12PM 16 03:05:12PM 17 03:05:12PM 18 03:05:26PM 19 03:05:40PM 20 03:05:42PM 21 03:05:43PM 22 03:05:43PM 22 03:05:43PM 22 03:05:43PM 22	 Q. Okay. Now, you talked a little bit this morning and earlier this afternoon about your calculation and the benefit to the government. In connection with that, there is discussion THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, let's not leave that last point. I thought the question was does the thirty percent number of monies that was disbursed include these funds returned to unsuccessful bidders or not, and your answer was you don't know. Why is it you don't know? THE WITNESS: Because I don't have a detailed audit of what the actual payments are or where they went. I'm trying to operate at a very high level without understanding the microdata. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. So you don't know, and if the if thirty percent disbursement does not include money that was returned to unsuccessful bidders, then you're way off, aren't you? A. I'm off by whatever the return to the unsuccessful bidders. THE COURT: If it were a third, as in this case, it would wipe out the delta. THE WITNESS: Well, that's a third of the disbursements, not a third of the revenues, but it would take a big chunk out of it, yes.

	356		358
03:05:55PM 1	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	03:09:32PM 1	should be considered disbursements and they would be how they
03:06:02PM 2	Q. By the way, Professor Cornell, and while we're having that	03:09:40PM 2	were drawn I don't know.
03:06:07РМ 3	exchange, which I recall in particular you did this afternoon	03:09:42PM 3	Q. Do you know what years IIM monies were deposited in banks
03:06:11PM 4	talk to Mr. Gingold this afternoon about monies held in banks as	03:09:49PM 4	rather than the Treasury?
03:06:18PM 5	opposed to held in the Treasury. Do you recall that?	03:09:50PM 5	A. Well, there was a document put up this afternoon I believe
03:06:20PM 6	A. Yes.	03:09:54PM 6	that continued up until the early 1930s.
03:06:20PM 7	Q. And so, for example, and this was even discussed I believe	03:09:57PM 7	Q. So the basis for your understanding is the Terry Keyhoe
03:06:24PM 8	during your direct, we looked again at this Defendants' Exhibit	03:10:03PM 8	document that Mr. Gringold showed you?
03:06:32PM 9	33, total balance on hand June 30th, 1999, of 10.9 million out	03:10:06PM 9	A. Yes.
03:06:39PM 10	of about 959.6 million is reported being held in bonded banks to	03:10:07PM 10	Q. Now, let me ask you about the interest calculations. Why
03:06:46PM 11	credit individual Indians, right?	03:10:17PM 11	don't we go back to Column H? I think it's Column H. It was
03:06:48PM 12	A. Yes.	03:10:22PM 12	Column H of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 41. Have you checked the
03:06:49PM 13	Q. How does your model strike that.	03:10:37PM 13	interest rates that were included in this column?
03:06:56PM 14	Isn't it true that your model, however, treats those	03:10:39PM 14	A. Yes.
03:06:59PM 15	monies as though they were held in the Treasury?	03:10:39PM 15	Q. Okay. And the reason I ask is the last two interest rates
03:07:02PM 16	A. The government, like an individual, can have many different	03:10:44PM 16	or the ones I should say for 2000 let's go to 2005, 2006, and
03:07:16PM 17	Treasury accounts. It could have been prior bank accounts. The	03:10:49PM 17	2007. They're all on the same page. Do you see 2005 is 4.22
03:07:21PM 18	critical question is when money leaves the bank where does it	03:11:03PM 18	percent and 2006 went up a hundred basis points to 5.22 percent?
03:07:24PM 19	go.	03:11:08PM 19	A. Yes.
03:07:24PM 20	Q. What's your understanding of the term there to credit	03:11:11PM 20	Q. And then to 6.22 percent in 2007?
03:07:29PM 21	Indians.	03:11:14PM 21	A. Yes.
03:07:33PM 22	A. I don't know exactly what that means.	03:11:15PM 22	Q. I'll tell you, I checked the Schiller Data on the website,
03:07:36PM 23	Q. Implicit in your calculation, though, is an assumption that	03:11:18PM 23	and we can pull that up if you want. Why don't we do that just
03:07:39PM 24	the government has free access to it, that the individual have	03:11:23PM 24	to make sure we're comparing it to the right one? We saw a
03:07:43PM 25	no right to it?	03:11:26PM 25	slightly different interest rate and I want to make sure we're
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	257		
	357		359
03:07:45PM 1	A. No, I don't think so.	03:11:30PM 1	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy,
03:07:47PM 2	A. No, I don't think so.Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could	03:11:46PM 2	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that.
03:07:47PM 2 03:07:52PM 3	A. No, I don't think so.Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury?	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either.
03:07:47PM 2 03:07:52PM 3 03:07:54PM 4	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the
03:07:47PM 2 03:07:52PM 3 03:07:54PM 4 03:07:58PM 5	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if 	03:12:05PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor?
03:07:47PM 2 03:07:52PM 3 03:07:54PM 4 03:07:58PM 5 03:08:05PM 6	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:03PM 5 03:12:12PM 6	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please.
03:07:47PM 2 03:07:52PM 3 03:07:54PM 4 03:07:54PM 5 03:08:05PM 6 03:08:05PM 7	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 3 0307-54PM 4 0307-54PM 5 0308.05PM 6 0308.05PM 7 0308.12PM 8	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it.
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 3 0307-54PM 4 0307-58PM 5 0308.03PM 6 0308.03PM 7 0308.12PM 8 0308.22PM 9	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:09PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8 03:12:25PM 9	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see
C3307-X7PM 2 C3307-S4PM 4 C3307-S4PM 5 C3308-0SPM 6 C3308-0SPM 7 C3308-12PM 8 C3308-22PM 9 C3308-22PM 10	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:35PM 10	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good.
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-52PM 3 03.07-54PM 4 03.07-58PM 5 03.08.05PM 6 03.08.05PM 7 03.08.12PM 8 03.08.22PM 9	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:09PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:36PM 11	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-52PM 5 0308-05PM 6 0308-05PM 7 0308-12PM 8 0308-22PM 9 0308-22PM 10 0308-32PM 11 0308-34PM 12	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:36PM 11 03:12:40PM 12	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over.
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-52PM 4 03.07-54PM 5 03.08.05PM 6 03.08.05PM 7 03.08.12PM 8 03.08.22PM 10 03.08.30PM 11 03.08.30PM 11 03.08.30PM 12	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:09PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:36PM 11 03:12:36PM 11	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-37PM 4 03.07-54PM 5 03.08.05PM 6 03.08.05PM 7 03.08.12PM 8 03.08.22PM 9 03.08.22PM 10 03.08.34PM 11 03.08.34PM 12 03.08.34PM 13	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:36PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:40PM 13	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that.
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-32PM 4 03.07-52PM 5 03.08.05PM 6 03.08.05PM 7 03.08.12PM 8 03.08.22PM 10 03.08.32PM 11 03.08.34PM 12 03.08.34PM 13 03.08.44PM 14	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:36PM 12 03:12:43PM 13 03:12:43PM 14	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76?
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-32PM 5 0308.03PM 6 0308.03PM 7 0308.12PM 8 0308.22PM 10 0308.32PM 11 0308.34PM 12 0308.34PM 13 0308.44PM 15	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:09PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:44PM 13 03:12:44PM 14 03:12:44PM 15	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes.
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-52PM 5 0308-05PM 6 0308-05PM 7 0308-12PM 8 0308-22PM 9 0308-22PM 10 0308-32PM 11 0308-34PM 12 0308-34PM 13 0308-44PM 15 0308-44PM 15 0308-45PM 16	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:36PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:49PM 14 03:12:49PM 15 03:12:49PM 16	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-32PM 4 03.07-53PM 5 03.08-05PM 6 03.08-05PM 7 03.08-12PM 8 03.08-22PM 9 03.08-22PM 10 03.08-32PM 12 03.08-34PM 12 03.08-34PM 13 03.08-44PM 15 03.08-44PM 15 03.08-44PM 16	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 8 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:43PM 13 03:12:44PM 15 03:12:45PM 15 03:12:45PM 16 03:12:45PM 16	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A?
0307-37PM 2 0307-58PM 4 0307-58PM 5 0308.05PM 6 0308.05PM 7 0308.12PM 8 0308.22PM 10 0308.30PM 11 0308.30PM 12 0308.34PM 13 0308.44PM 15 0308.45PM 16 0308.55PM 16 0308.55PM 17 0308.55PM 18	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:44PM 13 03:12:44PM 15 03:12:45PM 16 03:12:51PM 17 03:12:51PM 18	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-52PM 5 0308.05PM 6 0308.05PM 7 0308.12PM 9 0308.22PM 10 0308.32PM 11 0308.34PM 12 0308.34PM 13 0308.44PM 15 0308.45PM 16 0308.52PM 16 0308.52PM 17 0308.52PM 17	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:07PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:36PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:49PM 15 03:12:49PM 16 03:12:45PM 16 03:12:45PM 17 03:12:53PM 18 03:13:00PM 19	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break.
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-52PM 4 03.07-52PM 5 03.08.05PM 6 03.08.05PM 7 03.08.12PM 8 03.08.22PM 9 03.08.22PM 10 03.08.34PM 12 03.08.34PM 13 03.08.44PM 15 03.08.44PM 15 03.08.44PM 15 03.08.45PM 16 03.08.52PM 17 03.08.52PM 18 03.09.03PM 19 03.09.03PM 19	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition would be a hundred percent. 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:43PM 14 03:12:49PM 15 03:12:49PM 16 03:12:45PM 16 03:12:53PM 17 03:12:53PM 18 03:12:53PM 19 03:13:00PM 19	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break. Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate
03.07-37PM 2 03.07-32PM 4 03.07-52PM 5 03.08.03PM 6 03.08.03PM 7 03.08.12PM 8 03.08.22PM 10 03.08.32PM 11 03.08.34PM 12 03.08.34PM 15 03.08.34PM 15 03.08.34PM 15 03.08.34PM 16 03.08.34PM 17 03.08.34PM 18 03.09.35PM 18 03.09.03PM 19 03.08.03PM 20 03.09.03PM 21	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition would be a hundred percent. Q. Well, let's look a little bit higher on this exhibit under 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:44PM 13 03:12:44PM 15 03:12:45PM 16 03:12:51PM 17 03:12:51PM 17 03:12:53PM 18 03:13:00PM 19 03:13:00PM 20 03:13:05PM 21	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break. Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate was the appropriate way to gage interest here?
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-32PM 5 0308.03PM 6 0308.03PM 7 0308.12PM 9 0308.32PM 10 0308.32PM 12 0308.34PM 15 0308.34PM 15 0308.34PM 15 0308.34PM 16 0308.34PM 17 0308.35PM 18 0309.35PM 18 0309.03PM 20 0309.03PM 21 0309.03PM 21 0309.03PM 21 0309.03PM 21 0309.03PM 21	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition would be a hundred percent. Q. Well, let's look a little bit higher on this exhibit under disbursements, the third line, checks drawn by Indians on bank 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:44PM 14 03:12:44PM 15 03:12:45PM 16 03:12:45PM 17 03:12:55PM 18 03:13:05PM 20 03:13:05PM 20	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break. Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate was the appropriate way to gage interest here? A. Well, I believe that the government borrowing rate was, and
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-52PM 5 0308.03PM 6 0308.03PM 7 0308.12PM 9 0308.22PM 10 0308.32PM 12 0308.34PM 12 0308.34PM 15 0308.44PM 15 0308.44PM 15 0308.45PM 16 0308.53PM 17 0308.53PM 17 0308.53PM 18 0309.53PM 19 0309.03PM 19 0309.03PM 20 0309.03PM 21 0309.13PM 22 0309.13PM 233	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition would be a hundred percent. Q. Well, let's look a little bit higher on this exhibit under disbursements, the third line, checks drawn by Indians on bank accounts. Can you draw any inference from that as to who had 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:36PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:49PM 15 03:12:49PM 16 03:12:49PM 17 03:12:49PM 18 03:12:49PM 19 03:13:05PM 19 03:13:05PM 20 03:13:05PM 21 03:13:05PM 21 03:13:05PM 22 03:13:12PM 23	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break. Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate was the appropriate way to gage interest here? A. Well, I believe that the government borrowing rate was, and as I testified directly, I thought the average of the ten-year
0307-37PM 2 0307-32PM 4 0307-52PM 5 0308.05PM 6 0308.05PM 7 0308.12PM 9 0308.22PM 10 0308.32PM 11 0308.34PM 12 0308.34PM 15 0308.42PM 15 0308.45PM 16 0308.52PM 17 0308.52PM 18 0309.52PM 18 0309.52PM 19 0308.52PM 20 0309.52PM 20	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition would be a hundred percent. Q. Well, let's look a little bit higher on this exhibit under disbursements, the third line, checks drawn by Indians on bank accounts. Can you draw any inference from that as to who had the right to the funds in those bank accounts? 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:43PM 15 03:12:49PM 15 03:12:49PM 16 03:12:45PM 17 03:12:45PM 18 03:13:05PM 20 03:13:05PM 21 03:13:05PM 21 03:13:05PM 22 03:13:15PM 22 03:13:15PM 22	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break. Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate was the appropriate way to gage interest here? A. Well, I believe that the government borrowing rate was, and as I testified directly, I thought the average of the ten-year rate over the one-hundred-and-some-year period would be a good
03.07-47PM 2 03.07-54PM 4 03.07-54PM 5 03.08.05PM 6 03.08.05PM 7 03.08.12PM 9 03.08.22PM 10 03.08.24PM 12 03.08.34PM 12 03.08.34PM 15 03.08.34PM 15 03.08.34PM 16 03.08.34PM 17 03.08.54PM 16 03.08.54PM 17 03.08.54PM 19 03.08.05PM 19 03.08.05PM 20 03.09.05PM 20 03.09.05PM 21 03.09.05PM 22 03.09.15PM 23 03.09.15PM 23 03.09.15PM 23 03.09.15PM 23 03.09.15PM 23	 A. No, I don't think so. Q. How is it that the government can tap it just like it could tap money into the Treasury? A. We have the opinion the Treasury, the government should be disbursing funds according to the appropriate rules, but if there's a deposit at a bank, and I understand that the government would have the rights to recall those funds if it chose to. Q. If in fact the government didn't have free access to those funds that were held in credit for individual Indians, your model would overstate the benefit to the government; is that correct? A. Well, my model would still work. What you'd basically be saying, if the government could not take any of the monies that went into the bank accounts, let's take an extreme hypothetical. Ones it goes into a bank it cannot be used for the benefit of the government. It's either got to be disbursed to Indians or pilferred by some corrupt officials. Those are the alternatives. In that case the disbursement rate by definition would be a hundred percent. Q. Well, let's look a little bit higher on this exhibit under disbursements, the third line, checks drawn by Indians on bank accounts. Can you draw any inference from that as to who had the right to the funds in those bank accounts? A. If those funds were drawn by individual Indians, those 	03:11:46PM 2 03:12:05PM 3 03:12:05PM 4 03:12:05PM 5 03:12:12PM 6 03:12:25PM 7 03:12:25PM 9 03:12:25PM 10 03:12:35PM 11 03:12:40PM 12 03:12:43PM 15 03:12:49PM 15 03:12:49PM 16 03:12:45PM 17 03:12:45PM 18 03:13:05PM 20 03:13:05PM 21 03:13:05PM 21 03:13:05PM 22 03:13:15PM 22 03:13:15PM 22	going to the right source. And go to the last year's. Oh, boy, not that. A. I don't think you want that page either. MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, if I may approach the witness. I've got a hard copy. May I, your Honor? THE COURT: You may approach the witness, please. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY: Q. Why don't you try the third page and see if that does it. There we are. Okay. No, don't go that small, please. You see there, that's good. The column, it looks like it's one. You've got the years and then one, two, three, four, fifth column over. A. Yes, I see that. Q. The 4.22 and then 4.42 and 4.76? A. Yes. Q. Are those the figures that should have appeared in Attachment A? A. As I look at this, it makes me think I think so, but I can check that during the break. Q. How did you determine that the ten-year Treasury bond rate was the appropriate way to gage interest here? A. Well, I believe that the government borrowing rate was, and as I testified directly, I thought the average of the ten-year rate over the one-hundred-and-some-year period would be a good aapproximation of the average government borrowing rate.

	360		362
03:13:23PM 1	Q. Now	03:16:16PM 1	A. No. I interpreted as the intermediate. There's '20s and
03:13:24PM 2	A. And it's also a number that you have available. For	03:16:22PM 2	'30s.
03:13:28PM 3	example, the government hasn't issued 30-year bonds throughout	03:16:22PM 3	Q. But you said that data wasn't available for the entire
03:13:32PM 4	the time period.	03:16:24PM 4	A. Not continuously.
03:13:33PM 5	Q. Are you familiar with the factors that a money manager	03:16:25PM 5	Q. Okay. But of the available data, the ten-year was on the
03:13:38PM 6	would consider in making borrowing decisions?	03:16:29PM 6	high end, right?
03:13:40PM 7	A. When you say a money manager, are you talking about a	03:16:33PM 7	A. A little bit, but I felt the ten-year was a reasonable
03:13:45PM 8	government money manager or just any money manager?	03:16:36PM 8	approximation of the government's borrowing costs.
03:13:49PM 9	Q. We can take any money manager first.	03:16:38PM 9	Q. Have you undertaken any efforts to become informed about
33:13:51PM 10	A. Okay. Yes, I think I am.	03:16:41PM 10	how the government actually does make decisions as to how much
эз:13:53РМ 11	Q. And what are those factors?	03:16:44PM 11	to borrow?
эз:13:56РМ 12	A. Expected borrowing costs; risk. Those would be the two	03:16:45PM 12	A. As to how much?
3:14:04PM 13	most important.	03:16:46РМ 13	Q. Right.
3:14:05PM 14	Q. Okay. You look at the time that you're going to need to	03:16:47PM 14	A. Other than the general point that I spoke of a moment ago,
3:14:09PM 15	borrow; is that correct?	03:16:51PM 15	no.
3:14:10PM 16	A. If you're a very long-lived entity that just continually	03:16:51PM 16	Q. Well, and you were here this morning of course for Dr.
3:14:13PM 17	roles over that's less important. The U.S. government never	03:16:55PM 17	Miller's testimony. So let's try to go through it this way. In
3:14:19PM 18	really pays back its debt. In fact, it just gets bigger.	03:17:01PM 18	Attachment A, if you want to pull up Attachment A again, Exhibit
8:14:23PM 19	Q. We'll talk about that. Then let's talk about the people	03:17:08PM 19	41, for 2007, I'm going to take your corrected well, nominal
3:14:27PM 20	that make borrowing decisions for the United States. What do	03:17:20PM 20	amount to the government. That's the net amount of revenue over
:14:32PM 21	you know I'm sorry. Let me ask it differently. What's the	03:17:23PM 21	disbursements as you've calculated it, right?
3:14:34PM 22	basis for your understanding about how those decisions are made,	03:17:31PM 22	A. Yes.
:14:38PM 23	how much to borrow, say, at Treasury?	03:17:31PM 23	Q. And that's what you applied the interest rate to, correct?
3:14:41PM 24	A. Are you talking about how much to borrow, or how to borrow	03:17:36PM 24	A. Correct.
3:14:45PM 25	it? How to borrow, I mean what term of securities to issue.	03:17:36PM 25	Q. So 102 million, and we'll divide it by 52 weeks, it's about
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	361		363
4	0 100 4-1 1 1	1	
•	Q. I'll take either one. I have a suspicion it's a more	03:17:49PM 1	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is
:14:54PM 2	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you	03:17:55PM 2	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct?
14:54PM 2	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer?	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes.
14:54PM 2 :14:57PM 3 :14:58PM 4	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:58PM 4	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't
2 14:54PM 2 3 4:4:57PM 4 4:15:01PM 5	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:58PM 4 03:18:05PM 5	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that
2 3 4 4 14.58PM 5 5 15.06PM 6	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and
2 3 3 4:14.53PM 4 4 5:15.03PM 5 6 7	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions.
2 14:54PM 2 3 4 4 5:14:58PM 4 5:15:01PM 5 6 7 7 8 8	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:21PM 8	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions.
2 3 3 4 4 4 545PM 4 4 545PM 5 6 6 6 7 7 8 8 515:16PM 9	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt.	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:24PM 8 03:18:24PM 9	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing
2 2 3 4 4 4 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:24PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:31PM 10	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision?
2 14.54PM 2 3 4 4 515.01PM 5 6 7 7 815.10PM 8 115.10PM 9 115.20PM 10 115.20PM 10 115.20PM 11 115.20PM 11 115.20PM 11 115.20PM 11 115.20PM 11 11	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:24PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:31PM 10 03:18:32PM 11	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek
2 14.54PM 2 3 4 4 515.58PM 5 6 6 7 7 15.10PM 8 15.15.08PM 7 15.10PM 9 15.20PM 10 15.23PM 11 15.23PM 12 15.23PM 12 15.23PM 12	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:31PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:33PM 12	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say
2 14.54PM 2 3 4 4 4 15.04PM 5 6 15.04PM 6 7 8 15.04PM 9 10.15.24PM 10 115.24PM 115.24PM 115.24PM 115.24PM 12 115.24PM 12 115.24PM 13 115.2	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:24PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:31PM 10 03:18:32PM 11	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek
214.54PM 2 214.54PM 3 44 214.54PM 5 215.04PM 5 215.04PM 6 215.04PM 7 215.15PM 9 215.24PM 10 215.24PM 11 215.24PM 12 215.24PM 12 215.24PM 13 215.24PM 14	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:38PM 12	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way.
2 2 3 4 4 4 5 4 5 9 5 6 6 6 7 7 8 5 15 10 9 M 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond?	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:44PM 13 03:18:44PM 14	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April
2 14.54PM 2 3 4 4 4 545PM 5 6 5 6 5 5 6 6 5 6 7 7 8 6 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:32PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:42PM 13 03:18:42PM 14	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even
2 2 3 4 4 4 54PM 5 5 6 5 5 6 5 7 7 8 5 5 5 6 5 6 7 7 8 5 5 6 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:41PM 13 03:18:42PM 14 03:18:45PM 15	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't
2 2 3 4 4 4 5 4 5 9 5 6 6 7 7 8 5 15 5 10 P M 1 5 15 2 3 P M 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:34PM 11 03:18:34PM 12 03:18:44PM 15 03:18:45PM 15 03:18:55PM 16 03:18:55PM 17	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and
214.54PM 2 214.54PM 3 3 44.545PM 4 55.615.04PM 5 6 615.04PM 7 815.10PM 8 815.15.04PM 10 115.24PM 11 115.24PM 11 115.24PM 15 115.24PM 16 115.24PM 17 115.24PM 18 115.24PM 18 115.24PM 19	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change.	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:14PM 7 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:42PM 13 03:18:42PM 14 03:18:45PM 15 03:18:55PM 16 03:18:55PM 17	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It
214.54PM 2 334.454PM 4 4.15.01PM 5 6.15.04PM 6 6.15.04PM 7 8.15.16PM 9 1.15.20PM 10 1.15.23PM 11 1.15.23PM 12 1.15.33PM 14 1.15.34PM 15 1.15.44PM 17 1.15.44PM 17 1.15.44PM 17 1.15.44PM 18 1.15.44PM 19 1.15.44PM 19 1.15.44PM 19 1.15.44PM 19	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change. Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:24PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:32PM 15 03:18:35PM 15 03:18:35PM 17 03:18:55PM 17 03:18:55PM 18	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million
14.54PM 2 14.54PM 3 14.55PM 4 15.50PM 5 15.06PM 6 15.06PM 7 15.15PM 9 15.15PM 10 15.23PM 11 15.23PM 12 15.33PM 14 15.33PM 15 15.44PM 15 15.44PM 17 15.454PM 17 15.454PM 18 15.454PM 19 15.53PM 20 15.53PM 20 15.53PM 20	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change. Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times when the yield flips, but typically long-term rates are larger	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:34PM 11 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 15 03:18:42PM 15 03:18:52PM 16 03:18:55PM 17 03:18:55PM 18 03:19:02PM 19 03:19:03PM 20	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million people thought the same way it would affect the government in a
23:14:54PM 2 3:14:54PM 3 3:14:54PM 5 3:15:04PM 5 3:15:04PM 6 3:15:04PM 7 3:15:04PM 10 3:15:24PM 11 3:15:24PM 11 3:15:24PM 15 3:15:24PM 15 3:15:24PM 16 3:15:24PM 16 3:15:24PM 17 3:15:24PM 18 3:15:24PM 19 3:15:24PM 19 3:15:24PM 19 3:15:24PM 20 3:15:24PM 20 3:15:24PM 20 3:15:24PM 20 3:15:24PM 20	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change. Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times when the yield flips, but typically long-term rates are larger than short-term rates, right?	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:41PM 13 03:18:42PM 15 03:18:52PM 16 03:18:52PM 16 03:18:52PM 17 03:18:52PM 18 03:19:02PM 20 03:19:05PM 20	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million people thought the same way it would affect the government in a very real way so every little bit affects them. It's just that
3:14:54PM 2 3:14:54PM 3 3:14:54PM 5 3:15:01PM 5 3:15:08PM 7 3:15:08PM 10 3:15:16PM 9 3:15:23PM 11 3:15:23PM 12 3:15:23PM 15 3:15:24PM 15 3:15:24PM 15 3:15:24PM 15 3:15:24PM 17 3:15:24PM 17 3:15:24PM 18 3:15:24PM 19 3:15:24PM 19 3:15:24PM 20 3:15:24PM 21 3:15:24PM 22 3:16:01PM 22 3:16:05PM 23	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change. Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times when the yield flips, but typically long-term rates are larger than short-term rates, right? A. Somewhat. That's a very hotly researched and disputed	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:21PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:32PM 15 03:18:32PM 15 03:18:35PM 16 03:18:55PM 16 03:18:55PM 17 03:18:55PM 18 03:19:05PM 20 03:19:15PM 21 03:19:15PM 22	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million people thought the same way it would affect the government in a very real way so every little bit affects them. It's just that when you look at any little bit in isolation it seems
3:14:54PM	answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change. Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times when the yield flips, but typically long-term rates are larger than short-term rates, right? A. Somewhat. That's a very hotly researched and disputed issue, but typically that's been the case, yes.	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 12 03:18:32PM 15 03:18:32PM 15 03:18:52PM 16 03:18:55PM 17 03:18:55PM 18 03:19:02PM 20 03:19:15PM 21 03:19:15PM 21	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million people thought the same way it would affect the government in a very real way so every little bit affects them. It's just that when you look at any little bit in isolation it seems unimportant, but to the extent that they don't have two million
23:14:54PM 2 33:14:54PM 3 33:14:54PM 4 4 33:14:58PM 4 5 33:15:06PM 5 6 33:15:06PM 7 8 33:15:06PM 10 33:15:26PM 11 13:35:23PM 11 13:35:23PM 12 33:15:28PM 15 33:15:28PM 15 33:15:28PM 16 33:15:28PM 17 33:15:28PM 18 33:15:28PM 19 33:15:28PM 19 33:15:38PM 19 33:15:38PM 19 33:15:38PM 19 33:15:38PM 20	complicated question than I understand. So why don't you answer? A. Well, how to borrow, I think Dr. Miller was the better witness to answer that, but they basically have got to borrow enough to meet the operations to which the United States government has committed itself, which includes all the programmatic undertakings of the government, plus paying the interest and the principal on the maturing debt. Q. Is there a reason you didn't for example in putting together your analysis in Attachment A, a reason you didn't try to come up with some kind of weighted cost of capital or weighted cost of borrowing rather than just picking a particular debt instrument like the ten-year bond? A. Because you're not going to have data on that back a hundred years and I didn't think it was a material consideration to go through this massive analysis for what would have been a marginal change. Q. Long-term rates, and I understand that there can be times when the yield flips, but typically long-term rates are larger than short-term rates, right? A. Somewhat. That's a very hotly researched and disputed issue, but typically that's been the case, yes. Q. Okay. But for purposes of your choices, the ten-year bond	03:17:55PM 2 03:17:55PM 3 03:17:55PM 4 03:18:05PM 5 03:18:05PM 6 03:18:05PM 7 03:18:21PM 8 03:18:24PM 9 03:18:24PM 10 03:18:24PM 11 03:18:32PM 11 03:18:32PM 14 03:18:42PM 15 03:18:52PM 16 03:18:52PM 17 03:18:55PM 18 03:19:02PM 20 03:19:15PM 21 03:19:15PM 22 03:19:15PM 22 03:19:15PM 23 03:19:23PM 24	roughly \$2 million a week coming in net to the government; is that correct? A. Based on those numbers, yes. Q. And I'd like you to assume since I understand you don't have any knowledge about this, assume that the government, that the Treasury on a weekly basis looks at its borrowing needs and makes determinations of how much to borrow in the billions. A. Oh, it would easily be in the billions. Q. So \$2 million, that is going to be material to a borrowing decision? A. Well, I think you're making the famous mistake the Greek mathematicians made, which is because a number is small, say that you can't consider it that way. Let me give you an analogy. I paid my taxes in April and I wrote a check to the government. It's a lot smaller even than that. I can say, well, this isn't material, it doesn't affect their borrowing decision, how about if the government and I just forget it and I won't pay my taxes this year. It wouldn't affect anything. Unfortunately, if a hundred million people thought the same way it would affect the government in a very real way so every little bit affects them. It's just that when you look at any little bit in isolation it seems unimportant, but to the extent that they don't have two million here they are going to have to get it elsewhere.

	364		366
03:19:29PM 1	two million. Assume further, though, that when the government	03:22:57PM 1	A. Yes. The seventy percent was applied across the board from
03:19:34PM 2	makes the decision about how much to borrow, they don't borrow	03:23:01PM 2	the aggregate data.
03:19:38PM 3	based on a projection of, well, we need an extra two million.	03:23:02PM 3	Q. Now, in the series of Osage hypotheticals asked by Mr.
03:19:43PM 4	They say we're going to borrow, we're going to use a half	03:23:07PM 4	Warshawsky, he asked you to assume that the funds were held
03:19:48PM 5	billion dollars as the threshold. Say we calculate, we need 2.2	03:23:13PM 5	outside the IIM trust. Do you recall that?
6	billion coming up, we're going to borrow two billion. If we	03:23:15PM 6	A. Yes.
7	need 2.8 billion we're going to borrow three billion. Are you	7	Q. And he asked you a question if the funds were held outside
	with me?		·
0	A. Yes.		the IIM trust, would you include those funds in Attachment A, correct?
10	_	10	
44	Q. If that's the actual and I'm sure I've oversimplified	44	A. In the what?
40	it, but if that's basically the decision-making process that	40	Q. In Attachment A in your model.A. Yes.
42	goes on, isn't it true that that \$2 million isn't going to tip	42	
4.4	the borrowing decision one way or the other? A Liden't think that's correct legic because that could be	4.4	
	A. I don't think that's correct logic because that could be		A. Well, I said that if they never entered the IIM funds then
03:20:19PM 15 03:20:27PM 16	true of any \$2 million receipt and yet in the aggregate they do.	03:23:40PM 15	they should not be in HM receipts.
	So no, that's incorrect. \$2 million means \$2 million of added	03:23:43PM 16	Q. If the funds are held in trust in Treasury for the
03:20:30PM 17	borrowing. The way it flows through the actual decision making	03:23:47PM 17	individual Indians, should they be included in your model?
03:20:35PM 18	may be complex but the only way to think about it is it would	03:23:51PM 18	A. Well, then in my understanding they would be included and
03:20:38PM 19	increase the borrowing needs by \$2 million.	03:23:55PM 19	they should be.
03:20:42PM 20	Q. And with whom are you going to aggregate the \$2 million of	03:23:56PM 20	Q. So is it important as to whether they're held in a
03:20:46PM 21	income from the IIM trust here?	03:23:59PM 21	particular system in your opinion or whether they're held in the
03:20:48PM 22	A. With all the other sources that the government has in	03:24:03PM 22	Treasury?
03:20:51PM 23	revenue.	03:24:03PM 23	A. The importance as I understand it is that they'd be held in
03:20:57PM 24	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, may I take a short break?	03:24:12PM 24	the ITM trust for the benefit of individual Indians, not for the
03:20:59PM 25	THE COURT: A short break?	03:24:15PM 25	particular account.
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	265		267
1	MP_WAPSHAWSKY. Wall_just take a moment to confor	1	So if the account is labeled comothing other than the LIM
03:21:01PM 1	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer.	03:24:16PM 1	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM
03:21:03PM 2	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay.	03:24:20PM 2	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.)	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model?
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:26PM 4	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much.	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:26PM 4 03:24:31PM 5	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further.
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor.	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:26PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir.	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:26PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect?	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032433PM 5 032433PM 6 032433PM 7 032433PM 8	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA.
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:20PM 9	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes.	032428PM 2 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032433PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 8 032438PM 9	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032426PM 4 032431PM 5 032433PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 8 032438PM 9 032430PM 10	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it?
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:20PM 10 03:21:22PM 10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD:	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:25PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7 03:24:35PM 8 03:24:35PM 10 03:24:41PM 11	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 11	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:25PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7 03:24:35PM 8 03:24:35PM 10 03:24:40PM 10 03:24:41PM 11 03:24:43PM 12	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 12	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032443PM 11	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place.
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:28PM 8 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 13 03:21:25PM 13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7 03:24:35PM 8 03:24:35PM 10 03:24:41PM 11 03:24:41PM 11 03:24:41PM 12 03:24:45PM 13 03:24:45PM 14	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD:
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 13 03:22:06PM 14 03:22:13PM 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:24PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7 03:24:38PM 9 03:24:38PM 10 03:24:40PM 11 03:24:40PM 11 03:24:43PM 12 03:24:48PM 13	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 4 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 13 03:22:06PM 14 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:17PM 16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not?	032428PM 2 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032448PM 12 032448PM 14 032448PM 15 032458PM 15	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:17PM 5 03:21:17PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 13 03:22:05PM 14 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:17PM 16 03:22:17PM 16	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning.	032428PM 2 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032448PM 12 032448PM 14 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 16	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written?
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 13 03:22:06PM 14 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:17PM 16 03:22:24PM 17 03:22:24PM 18	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:24PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7 03:24:33PM 10 03:24:40PM 10 03:24:40PM 11 03:24:43PM 12 03:24:48PM 13 03:24:48PM 14 03:24:48PM 15 03:24:53PM 16 03:24:53PM 17 03:25:01PM 18	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared?
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:35PM 14 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:17PM 16 03:22:17PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 19	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that	03:24:20PM 2 03:24:24PM 3 03:24:28PM 4 03:24:31PM 5 03:24:31PM 6 03:24:33PM 7 03:24:33PM 9 03:24:34PM 10 03:24:41PM 11 03:24:43PM 12 03:24:43PM 12 03:24:48PM 15 03:24:48PM 15 03:24:59PM 16 03:24:59PM 17 03:25:01PM 18 03:25:01PM 18	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:04PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 5 03:21:18PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 14 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 16 03:22:13PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 19 03:22:33PM 19	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals?	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032443PM 12 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032458PM 17 032458PM 18	 Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds?
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:18PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:35PM 15 03:22:17PM 16 03:22:17PM 16 03:22:17PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 19 03:22:33PM 20 03:22:33PM 21	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals? A. No.	032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 18 032458PM 18 032458PM 18 032458PM 19 032458PM 19 032458PM 16 032458PM 16 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032458PM 18 032458PM 19 032504PM 18	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds? A. No.
0321:03PM 2 0321:03PM 3 0321:15PM 4 0321:15PM 5 0321:15PM 6 0321:18PM 7 0321:20PM 8 0321:22PM 10 0321:25PM 11 0321:25PM 12 0321:25PM 15 0322:15PM 15 0322:17PM 16 0322:17PM 16 0322:17PM 18 0322:3PM 19 0322:3PM 20 0322:3PM 20 0322:3PM 21	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals? A. No. Q. So the seventy percent disbursement you applied to the	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032438PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032443PM 11 032443PM 12 032448PM 15 032458PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032501PM 18 032501PM 18 032507PM 20 032507PM 21 032507PM 22	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds? A. No. Q. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a check is written for
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 5 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:16PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 15 03:21:35PM 15 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 16 03:22:13PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 19 03:22:33PM 20 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:42PM 22 03:22:42PM 22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals? A. No. Q. So the seventy percent disbursement you applied to the Osage individuals was applied even though you didn't have a	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032443PM 11 032443PM 12 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032501PM 18 032501PM 18 032507PM 20 032507PM 21 032507PM 22 032513PM 23	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds? A. No. Q. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a check is written for an individual Indian that comes out of the 14X6039 account, if
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 4 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:15PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 15 03:22:15PM 16 03:22:15PM 16 03:22:15PM 16 03:22:15PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 20 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:45PM 22 03:22:45PM 22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals? A. No. Q. So the seventy percent disbursement you applied to the Osage individuals was applied even though you didn't have a single shred of evidence that any money went to the Osage,	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032458PM 18 032458PM 20 03250PM 20 03250PM 21 03250PM 21 032518PM 22 032518PM 23	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds? A. No. Q. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a check is written for an individual Indian that comes out of the 14X6039 account, if the funds are then immediately transferred to Treasury, general
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 3 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 5 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:16PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 11 03:21:25PM 15 03:21:35PM 15 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 15 03:22:13PM 16 03:22:13PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 19 03:22:33PM 20 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:42PM 22 03:22:42PM 22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals? A. No. Q. So the seventy percent disbursement you applied to the Osage individuals was applied even though you didn't have a single shred of evidence that any money went to the Osage, correct?	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032443PM 11 032443PM 12 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032501PM 18 032501PM 18 032507PM 20 032507PM 21 032507PM 22 032513PM 23	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds? A. No. Q. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a check is written for an individual Indian that comes out of the 14X6039 account, if the funds are then immediately transferred to Treasury, general account, and they stay in the general account until the checks
03:21:03PM 2 03:21:03PM 4 03:21:15PM 4 03:21:15PM 6 03:21:15PM 7 03:21:20PM 8 03:21:22PM 9 03:21:22PM 10 03:21:22PM 11 03:21:25PM 12 03:21:25PM 15 03:22:15PM 16 03:22:15PM 16 03:22:15PM 16 03:22:15PM 17 03:22:24PM 18 03:22:33PM 20 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:35PM 21 03:22:45PM 22 03:22:45PM 22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, just take a moment to confer. THE COURT: Yes. Okay. (There was a pause in the proceeding.) MR. WARSHAWSKY: Professor Cornell, thank you very much. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Any redirect? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Professor Cornell, Mr. Warshawsky asked you several hypothetical questions, one of which is if in fact the Osage individual Indian trust funds did not have a 4844ALC, would you be able to conclude that seventy percent of the funds represented in the CRA database were disbursed or not? A. I remember that line of questioning. Q. If in fact the Osage individual Indian trust beneficiaries checks did not have the 4844 ALC, do you have any evidence that any of those funds were disbursed to the individuals? A. No. Q. So the seventy percent disbursement you applied to the Osage individuals was applied even though you didn't have a single shred of evidence that any money went to the Osage,	032420PM 2 032424PM 3 032428PM 4 032431PM 5 032431PM 6 032433PM 7 032438PM 9 032438PM 10 032438PM 11 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032448PM 15 032458PM 16 032458PM 17 032458PM 18 032458PM 20 03250PM 20 03250PM 21 03250PM 21 032518PM 22 032518PM 23	Q. So if the account is labeled something other than the IIM trust but the funds are held in trust in the Treasury, should they be included in your model? A. I think so, but I'd want to make sure I understand it a little further. THE COURT: I want to make sure I understand it a little further too. I thought this whole thing was premised on the TGA. BY MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is, your Honor. Would you like me to explain it? THE COURT: I'd like you to ask sharper questions so that we know whether the money is in the TGA or some other place. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. Are you aware of what happens when a check is cut on funds held by the Treasury? Let's say in the 14X6039 account, what happens to the funds when a check is actually written? A. Well, when it's written, you mean when it's cleared? Q. No. When a check is actually written do you know what happens to the funds? A. No. Q. Let me give you a hypothetical. If a check is written for an individual Indian that comes out of the 14X6039 account, if the funds are then immediately transferred to Treasury, general

	368		370
03:25:29PM 1	are negotiated or paid, is it your understanding those funds are	03:28:24PM 1	THE COURT: I didn't understand that. You're asking
03:25:35PM 2	being held in the general account until such time, if my	03:28:28PM 2	for a sum of money that is restitution.
03:25:41PM 3	hypothetical is true, until such time as the check is actually	03:28:33PM 3	BY MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.
03:25:45PM 4	paid?	03:28:33PM 4	THE COURT: You're asking for this restitutionary sum
03:25:45PM 5	A. Yes.	03:28:36PM 5	of money to be given to a plaintiff class.
03:25:46PM 6	Q. Whatever amount of time that would take, correct?	03:28:39PM 6	MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.
03:25:49PM 7	A. Correct.	03:28:40PM 7	THE COURT: Are owners of Osage headrights members of
03:25:50PM 8	Q. Now, if the Osage funds were held in an Osage account and	03:28:47PM 8	the plaintiff class?
03:25:56PM 9	the Treasury cut checks to the individuals and their funds were	03:28:48PM 9	MR. GINGOLD: Yes, they are. They're individual
03:26:04PM 10	similarly transferred into the general Treasury account, under	03:28:49PM 10	Indian trust beneficiaries in accordance with February 4th,
03:26:09PM 11	those circumstances that I described in the hypothetical	03:28:54PM 11	1998.
03:26:12PM 12	wouldn't they too remain in the general Treasury until the	03:28:55PM 12	THE COURT: Okay. And is it your position that if
03:26:14PM 13	checks were paid?	03:28:58PM 13	this money, that this hypothetical award of restitution is made
03:26:15PM 14	A. The way you've described it, yes, it sounds so.	03:29:04PM 14	to the plaintiff class, that it will be distributed equally
03:26:22PM 15	Q. Now, if in fact all of the funds of the Osage that are held	03:29:07PM 15	among all Native Americans?
03:26:25PM 16	in that account, or no, 98-and-a-half percent, assuming	03:29:09PM 16	BY MR. GINGOLD: What we've said in our briefs is this
03:26:31PM 17	98-and-a-half percent of the funds held in the Osage account are	03:29:11PM 17	Court can make a determination on how the funds should be
03:26:38PM 18	soley the only rights to those funds are solely in the	03:29:15PM 18	distributed. We believe, however, it's within the discretion of
03:26:42PM 19	individuals, would you assume that those funds are the	03:29:17PM 19	this Court, your Honor. We believe, however, because we're
03:26:48PM 20	individuals' funds? If all rights to those funds are the	03:29:21PM 20	seeking benefit conferred, it is proper to distribute the funds
03:26:52PM 21	individuals' rights, would you assume those funds are the	03:29:27PM 21	on a per capita basis. To the extent that an individual
03:26:54PM 22	individuals' funds?	03:29:31PM 22	THE COURT: Have you told the Osage about that?
03:26:54PM 23	A. Yes.	03:29:33PM 23	MR. GRINGOLD: Yes, as a matter of fact we did. We
03:26:55PM 24	Q. If in fact the individuals paid taxes on those funds would	03:29:34PM 24	went down to the Osage when we filed this action in 1996. We
03:27:00PM 25	you assume that they're the individuals' funds?	03:29:38PM 25	met with the Osage individuals in the Osage tribe and they
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR Official Court Reporter
	·		·
03:27:02PM 1	Official Court Reporter	03:29:41PM 1	Official Court Reporter
03:27:02PM 1 2	Official Court Reporter 369	03:29:41PM 1 03:29:46PM 2	Official Court Reporter 371
_	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes.		Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there.
03:27:02PM 2	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the	03:29:46PM 2	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor.
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed.
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3 03:27:09PM 4	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds?	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3 03:29:49PM 4	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3 03:27:09PM 4 03:27:12PM 5	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes.	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3 03:29:49PM 4 03:29:49PM 5	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:13PM 7 03:27:20PM 8	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.47PM 3 03.29.48PM 4 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.57PM 6 03.30.00PM 7 03.30.00PM 8	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:14PM 7 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:21PM 9	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.47PM 3 03.29.44PM 4 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.00PM 7 03.30.03PM 8 03.30.05PM 9	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3 03:27:09PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:14PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:23PM 10	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3 03:29:47PM 4 03:29:54PM 5 03:29:57PM 6 03:30:05PM 7 03:30:05PM 8 03:30:05PM 9 03:30:05PM 10	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:13PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:20PM 9 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:23PM 11	Official Court Reporter 369 A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.47PM 3 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.03PM 8 03.30.03PM 8 03.30.05PM 10 03.30.15PM 11	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:16PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:25PM 11 03:27:30PM 12	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.47PM 3 03.29.48PM 4 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.06PM 7 03.30.03PM 8 03.30.06PM 9 03.30.05PM 10 03.30.15PM 11 03.30.15PM 12	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:07PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:12PM 6 03:27:13PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:21PM 10 03:27:25PM 11 03:27:30PM 12 03:27:30PM 13	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3 03:29:47PM 5 03:29:57PM 6 03:30:05PM 7 03:30:05PM 9 03:30:05PM 10 03:30:15PM 11 03:30:25PM 12 03:30:25PM 13	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained.
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:14PM 7 03:27:24PM 9 03:27:24PM 10 03:27:25PM 11 03:27:35PM 12 03:27:35PM 13 03:27:35PM 14	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.47PM 3 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.03PM 8 03.30.03PM 8 03.30.05PM 10 03.30.15PM 11 03.30.25PM 12 03.30.25PM 13 03.30.25PM 14	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD:
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:12PM 6 03:27:13PM 7 03:27:24PM 8 03:27:24PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:33PM 12 03:27:39PM 13 03:27:39PM 14 03:27:34PM 15	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage.	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.46PM 4 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.05PM 8 03.30.05PM 10 03.30.15PM 11 03.30.25PM 12 03.30.25PM 13 03.30.25PM 14 03.30.25PM 14	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:14PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:30PM 12 03:27:39PM 14 03:27:34PM 15 03:27:44PM 15	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage. BY MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, because we're looking at	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3 03:29:47PM 5 03:29:54PM 5 03:30:03PM 7 03:30:03PM 9 03:30:03PM 10 03:30:15PM 11 03:30:25PM 12 03:30:25PM 13 03:30:25PM 14 03:30:25PM 15 03:30:27PM 16	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue,
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:12PM 7 03:27:12PM 8 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:23PM 12 03:27:33PM 13 03:27:33PM 14 03:27:43PM 15 03:27:44PM 15 03:27:44PM 16 03:27:44PM 17	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage. BY MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, because we're looking at restitution, which is a benefit conferred on the government and	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:47PM 3 03:29:47PM 5 03:29:57PM 6 03:30:03PM 8 03:30:03PM 10 03:30:03PM 11 03:30:25PM 12 03:30:25PM 13 03:30:25PM 14 03:30:25PM 15 03:30:27PM 16 03:30:32PM 17	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue, and again Dr. Laycock confirmed that in review. So we're
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:12PM 6 03:27:12PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:33PM 12 03:27:33PM 13 03:27:34PM 15 03:27:44PM 15 03:27:44PM 16 03:27:44PM 17 03:27:43PM 18	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage. BY MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, because we're looking at restitution, which is a benefit conferred on the government and not the injury sustained by the individual, and as Professor	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.46PM 4 03.29.46PM 5 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.05PM 8 03.30.05PM 10 03.30.15PM 11 03.30.25PM 12 03.30.25PM 14 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 17 03.30.35PM 17	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue, and again Dr. Laycock confirmed that in review. So we're dealing with a situation where we, Plaintiffs' counsel asked you
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:14PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:33PM 14 03:27:33PM 15 03:27:43PM 15 03:27:43PM 16 03:27:43PM 17 03:27:53PM 18 03:27:53PM 18	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage. BY MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, because we're looking at restitution, which is a benefit conferred on the government and not the injury sustained by the individual, and as Professor Laycock is	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.46PM 4 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.06PM 7 03.30.06PM 9 03.30.06PM 11 03.30.15PM 11 03.30.25PM 12 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 16 03.30.25PM 17 03.30.36PM 18 03.30.36PM 18	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue, and again Dr. Laycock confirmed that in review. So we're dealing with a situation where we, Plaintiffs' counsel asked you to apply a seventy-percent rate across the board without regard
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:12PM 6 03:27:12PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:21PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:32PM 12 03:27:32PM 14 03:27:32PM 15 03:27:45PM 16 03:27:45PM 16 03:27:45PM 17 03:27:53PM 18 03:27:53PM 18 03:27:53PM 19 03:28:03PM 20	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage. BY MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, because we're looking at restitution, which is a benefit conferred on the government and not the injury sustained by the individual, and as Professor Laycock stated in his testimony, if in fact Professor Laycock is correct in his understanding of the law, the only thing that	03:29:46PM 2 03:29:46PM 4 03:29:46PM 5 03:29:57PM 6 03:30:05PM 9 03:30:05PM 10 03:30:05PM 11 03:30:25PM 12 03:30:25PM 15 03:30:25PM 16 03:30:25PM 16 03:30:25PM 17 03:30:35PM 18 03:30:35PM 19 03:30:45PM 20	official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue, and again Dr. Laycock confirmed that in review. So we're dealing with a situation where we, Plaintiffs' counsel asked you to apply a seventy-percent rate across the board without regard to what tribe any individual is a member of?
03:27:02PM 2 03:27:02PM 3 03:27:03PM 4 03:27:12PM 5 03:27:13PM 6 03:27:16PM 7 03:27:20PM 8 03:27:21PM 9 03:27:23PM 10 03:27:23PM 11 03:27:30PM 12 03:27:39PM 15 03:27:41PM 15 03:27:48PM 16 03:27:48PM 17 03:27:53PM 18 03:27:53PM 18	A. Yes. Q. If you assume that the government used to issue K-1s to the individuals whose funds were held in that account, would you assume that's from the individuals' funds? A. Yes. Q. And today if you assumed that the government issued 1099 forms for those funds that are held in that account, would you assume that the individuals' funds MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm far beyond Professor Cornell's expertise. THE COURT: Oh, he's making a lot of assumptions. I'm happy to hear them. What I want to know is whether the Plaintiffs' position is that all Native Americans are entitled to an undifferentiated share of all the money that may have been held for the Osage. BY MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, because we're looking at restitution, which is a benefit conferred on the government and not the injury sustained by the individual, and as Professor Laycock is	03.29.46PM 2 03.29.46PM 4 03.29.54PM 5 03.29.54PM 6 03.30.06PM 7 03.30.06PM 9 03.30.06PM 11 03.30.15PM 11 03.30.25PM 12 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 15 03.30.25PM 16 03.30.25PM 17 03.30.36PM 18 03.30.36PM 18	Official Court Reporter 371 endorsed us, and Ms. Cobell and I and others were down there. Yes, we did, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Proceed. MR. GINGOLD: But your Honor, one of the most important aspects of this is, and when we filed in litigation in response to your question we looked at this issue quite carefully, we looked at whether or not we believed there would be any preconclusion with regard to the damages claims to the extent that an individual would be damaged and otherwise wouldn't be able to be, let's say, obtain justice in this court because we're well aware of all the issues and we concluded and we believe the law is quite clear as Professor Laycock explained. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. There is no preconclusion, there is no barring as long as you don't obtain a double recovery, so we looked at that issue, and again Dr. Laycock confirmed that in review. So we're dealing with a situation where we, Plaintiffs' counsel asked you to apply a seventy-percent rate across the board without regard

17 of 35 sheets Page 368 to 371 of 381 06/12/2008 07: 22: 47 AM

03:30:57PM **23**

03:30:58PM **24**

that, do you know?

A. I don't recall.

Q. Was there any issue with respect to the reliability of the

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR

Official Court Reporter

03:28:16PM **23**

03:28:19PM **24**

receive whatever injuries they sustained they could also recover

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR

Official Court Reporter

in damages on that which remains if they chose to bring that

action in the proper court.

		1	
_	372		374
03:31:04PM 1	data that otherwise exists?	03:33:51PM 1	as of September 30, 2006 and 2005. It goes on almost the entire
03:31:06PM 2	A. Oh, oh, I thought were you asking a different question.	03:33:58PM 2	paragraph. Do you see that?
03:31:08PM 3	Yes, as I testified earlier, that Plaintiffs' counsel said that	03:33:59PM 3	A. Yes.
03:31:14PM 4	the bits and pieces of disbursement data that were available	03:33:59PM 4	Q. So this is a qualified audit, correct?
03:31:17PM 5	were highly unreliable and there would be testimony as to that,	03:34:02PM 5	A. It looks like it, yes.
03:31:22PM 6	and I therefore said, well, the most reliable thing I have is	03:34:04PM 6	Q. Okay. I'd like you to turn your attention to the next
03:31:27PM 7	the CPNR data and I will use that pending further word from the	03:34:07PM 7	page, the first paragraph in the next page. It states, Our
	government. Q. Now, Mr. Warshawsky identified DX438, which is the		consideration of internal control over financial reporting resulted in a following condition being identified as a
10	Independent Auditors' Report of Tribal and Other Trust Funds and	03:34:23PM 9	reportable condition. Reliance and processing of trust
03:31:39PM	Individual Indian Monies Funds Financial Statements for fiscal	03:34:30PM 11	transactions at the Bureau of Indian Affairs and unresolved
03:31:47PM 12	years 2006 and 2005. Do you recall seeing a page?	03:34:34PM 12	financial reporting matters from prior periods, we consider this
03:31:53PM 13	A. Yes. I still have that up here in fact.	03:34:37PM 13	reportable condition to be a material weakness. Do you have any
03:31:55PM 14	Q. And I believe Mr. Warshawsky pointed you to page 438. If	03:34:42PM 14	understanding of what that means?
03:32:01PM 15	you can please look at that.	03:34:43PM 15	A. It means that they're not comfortable with the financial
03:32:02PM 16	A. I actually still have it open there.	03:34:49PM 16	controls and reporting.
03:32:04PM 17	Q. Okay. Now, this is for both fiscal years 2006 and 2005,	03:34:52PM 17	Q. I'd like you to turn to the next page, page 34. Under the
03:32:10PM 18	correct?	03:35:00PM 18	paragraph that's identified as condition, the second paragraph
03:32:10PM 19	A. Yes.	03:35:04PM 19	under that, I'd like to read this to you. If you can, is this
03:32:11PM 20	Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to DX438 at page 31.	03:35:10PM 20	clear enough on the screen?
03:32:21PM 21	A. 31?	03:35:11PM 21	A. Yes, I'm there.
03:32:22PM 22	Q. Yes, that's correct. And if you see it says tribal and	03:35:12PM 22	Q. The financial information systems and internal control
03:32:30PM 23	other trust funds and individual Indian monies trust funds	03:35:15PM 23	procedures used
03:32:34PM 24	managed by the U.S. Department of the Interior independent	03:35:17PM 24	THE COURT: Mr. Gingold?
03:32:39PM 25	auditors' report of internal conform on financial reporting and	03:35:20PM 25	MR. GINGOLD: Yes.
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	373		375
03:32:44PM 1	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that?	03:35:20PM 1	375 THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times.
03:32:44PM 1 2 2 03:32:47PM 3	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes.	03:35:20PM 1 03:35:23PM 2 03:35:23PM 3	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the
03:32:47PM 2	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes.	03:35:23PM 2	375 THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times.
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct?	03:35:23PM 2 03:35:30PM 3	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3 03:32:49PM 4	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes.	03:35:23PM 2 03:35:30PM 3 03:35:36PM 4	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:50PM 5	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have	03:35:23PM 2 03:35:30PM 3 03:35:36PM 4 03:35:42PM 5	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6	373 compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back?	03:35:23PM 2 03:35:30PM 3 03:35:36PM 4 03:35:42PM 5 03:35:46PM 6	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent.
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:52PM 7	and it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen.	03:35:23PM 2 03:35:30PM 3 03:35:36PM 4 03:35:42PM 5 03:35:46PM 6 03:35:49PM 7	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:52PM 7 03:32:52PM 8	arguments and the compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD:	033539M 2 033539PM 3 033538PM 4 033538PM 5 033548PM 6 033548PM 7 033558PM 9 033658PM 9	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 3 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:50PM 6 03:32:52PM 7 03:32:53PM 8 03:32:53PM 9 03:33:01PM 10 03:33:01PM 11	a. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct?	03.35.28PM 2 03.35.36PM 4 03.35.36PM 5 03.35.42PM 5 03.35.48PM 6 03.35.48PM 7 03.35.56PM 8 03.35.56PM 10 03.36.02PM 11	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:59PM 5 03:32:59PM 6 03:32:59PM 7 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct.	033639PM 2 033636PM 4 033636PM 5 033632PM 6 033636PM 7 033656PM 8 033656PM 9 033656PM 10 033602PM 11 033603PM 12	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:49PM 5 03:32:50PM 6 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:52PM 7 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit	033539M 2 033539PM 4 033539PM 5 033549PM 5 033549PM 7 033559PM 9 033659PM 10 033659PM 11 033659PM 12 033659PM 13	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:50PM 6 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:52PM 7 03:32:53PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:04PM 14	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified?	033638PM 2 033638PM 4 033638PM 5 033638PM 6 033638PM 7 033658PM 8 033658PM 10 033608PM 11 033608PM 12 033608PM 13 033608PM 13	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:50PM 6 03:32:50PM 7 03:32:50PM 8 03:32:50PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:01PM 12 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:04PM 14 03:33:04PM 15	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the	033638PM 2 033638PM 4 033638PM 5 033638PM 6 033638PM 7 033658PM 8 033658PM 10 033608PM 11 033608PM 12 0336381PPM 14 033614PM 15	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that Information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:49PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:53PM 7 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:04PM 14 03:33:04PM 15 03:33:14PM 15	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to	0336329M 2 033636PM 4 033632PM 5 033632PM 6 033632PM 7 0336358PM 9 0336358PM 10 0336369PM 12 0336369PM 12 0336369PM 12 0336369PM 13 033632PM 14 033632PM 15 033632PM 16	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:49PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:32:59PM 11 03:33:04PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:10PM 15 03:33:10PM 16 03:33:10PM 16 03:33:10PM 17	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion.	0336329M 2 0336329M 4 0336329M 5 0336329M 6 0336329M 7 03363589M 9 0336589M 10 0336589M 11 0336589M 12 0336589M 12 0336589M 12 0336589M 15 0336589M 16 0336589M 17	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information.
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:53PM 7 03:32:53PM 8 03:32:53PM 10 03:33:01PM 10 03:33:01PM 12 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:04PM 15 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 17 03:33:15PM 17	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32.	0336329PM 2 033636PM 4 033636PM 5 033636PM 6 033636PM 7 033656PM 8 033656PM 10 033656PM 11 033603PM 12 033603PM 12 033603PM 15 033632PM 15 033632PM 16 033632PM 16 033632PM 18	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information. THE COURT: I thought that's what yesterday was all
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:49PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:32:59PM 11 03:33:04PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:10PM 15 03:33:10PM 16 03:33:10PM 16 03:33:10PM 17	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32.	033638PM 2 033638PM 4 033638PM 5 033638PM 6 033638PM 7 033638PM 10 033638PM 11 033638PM 12 033638PM 14 033638PM 14 033638PM 15 033638PM 15 033638PM 17 033638PM 16 033638PM 17	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information.
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:49PM 4 03:32:59PM 5 03:32:59PM 7 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:32:59PM 11 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 15 03:33:10PM 15 03:33:10PM 16 03:33:17PM 18 03:33:17PM 18 03:33:17PM 18	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32. A. Okay.	0336329M 2 033636PM 4 033632PM 5 033632PM 6 033632PM 7 033656PM 8 033656PM 10 033632PM 11 033639PM 12 033639PM 15 033632PM 15 033632PM 16 033622PM 16 033622PM 18 033622PM 18	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information. THE COURT: I thought that's what yesterday was all about.
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:49PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:59PM 8 03:32:59PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:04PM 15 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 17 03:33:15PM 18 03:33:23PM 19 03:33:23PM 20	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32. A. Okay. Q. If we can focus in on the paragraph which is a summary	0336329M 2 033636PM 4 033632PM 5 033632PM 6 033638PM 7 033638PM 9 033638PM 10 033638PM 12 033638PM 12 033638PM 15 033638PM 15 033638PM 16 033638PM 17 033638PM 17 033638PM 18 033638PM 19 033638PM 20	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information. THE COURT: I thought that's what yesterday was all about. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I don't recall this report
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:47PM 4 03:32:50PM 5 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:51PM 6 03:32:52PM 7 03:32:59PM 9 03:33:01PM 10 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:04PM 12 03:33:04PM 13 03:33:04PM 15 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 17 03:33:15PM 18 03:33:23PM 19 03:33:23PM 20 03:33:23PM 20	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32. A. Okay. Q. If we can focus in on the paragraph which is a summary paragraph. The first sentence begins in that paragraph, Our	0336329M 2 0336329M 4 0336329M 5 0336329M 6 0336369PM 7 0336569PM 10 0336569PM 11 0336039PM 12 0336039PM 13 033639PM 15 033639PM 16 033639PM 17 0336329PM 17 0336329PM 17 0336329PM 19 0336339PM 20 0336339PM 20	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information. THE COURT: I thought that's what yesterday was all about. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I don't recall this report being introduced.
03:32:47PM 2 03:32:43PM 4 03:32:59PM 5 03:32:59PM 6 03:32:59PM 9 03:32:59PM 10 03:32:59PM 11 03:33:01PM 11 03:33:01PM 12 03:33:01PM 15 03:33:15PM 15 03:33:15PM 16 03:33:15PM 17 03:33:15PM 18 03:33:23PM 19 03:33:23PM 20 03:33:23PM 20 03:33:23PM 21	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32. A. Okay. Q. If we can focus in on the paragraph which is a summary paragraph. The first sentence begins in that paragraph, Our audit reports on the trust funds financial statements were	0336329PM 2 033636PM 4 033636PM 5 033636PM 6 033636PPM 7 033636PPM 10 033636PPM 11 0336369PM 12 033639PM 15 033632PPM 15 033632PPM 16 033632PPM 18 033632PPM 18 033632PPM 19 033633PPM 20 033633PPM 21 033633PPM 21	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information. THE COURT: I thought that's what yesterday was all about. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I don't recall this report being introduced. THE COURT: Not this report but this general subject.
03.32-47PM 2 03.32-47PM 4 03.32-59PM 5 03.32-59PM 6 03.32-59PM 7 03.32-59PM 9 03.33-59PM 10 03.33-01PM 11 03.33-01PM 12 03.33-01PM 15 03.33-10PM 15 03.33-10PM 15 03.33-11PM 16 03.33-11PM 16 03.33-12PM 17 03.33-12PM 18 03.33-23PM 20 03.33-23PM 21 03.33-23PM 21 03.33-37PM 22 03.33-33PM 23	compliance with other matters. Do you see that? A. Yes. Q. And it's dated 2006, correct? A. Yes. MR. GRINGOLD: Your Honor, would you like us to have this brought back? THE COURT: Yes, please, on the screen. BY MR. GRINGOLD: Q. You've stated you're not an auditor, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you've stated you're not a C.P.A., correct? A. Correct. Q. Do you have any understanding of what it means if an audit is qualified? A. Well, if an audit is qualified it usually means that the auditor does not feel that they have adequate information to provide their normal audited opinion. Q. Please turn to page 32. A. Okay. Q. If we can focus in on the paragraph which is a summary paragraph. The first sentence begins in that paragraph, Our audit reports on the trust funds financial statements were qualified because it was not practical to extend our auditing	0336329M 2 033636PM 4 033632PM 5 033632PM 6 033636PM 7 033658PM 9 033658PM 10 033658PM 12 033658PM 12 033658PM 15 033658PM 15 033638PM 15 033632PM 16 033632PM 17 033632PM 19 033632PM 20 033633PM 20 033633PM 22 033633PM 23	THE COURT: This litany we've heard a number of times. What you're doing now is asking this witness to affirm the instructions you gave him about what to use. He's already said if the data are correct my methodology is correct; if not, it's not. He's not vouching for these numbers. I don't understand him to be vouching for this decision to use the seventy percent. That was your decision. That's what he told us. Now, right now what you're trying to do is to get him to agree that the instructions you gave him were the correct instructions, and that's out of bounds. MR. GINGOLD: No, sir, that's not what I'm doing. Mr. Warshawsky introduced this exhibit and identified particular disbursement information on the page that he identified and basically asked him if he saw that information. He said he did not. One of the things that I was going to be pointing out in here, since Mr. Warshawsky opened the door, was the auditors themselves said you cannot rely on the information. THE COURT: I thought that's what yesterday was all about. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I don't recall this report being introduced. THE COURT: Not this report but this general subject. We went through all of the Arthur Andersen qualified audits. I

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR

Official Court Reporter

Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR

Official Court Reporter

	376		378
03:36:57PM 1	methodology and the disbursement numbers he used were the	03:40:03РМ 1	With regard to the seventy percent disbursement
03:37:00PM 2	numbers you gave him. He's told us that the Osage should not	03:40:06PM 2	figure, did you testify that you assumed that all disbursements
03:37:05PM 3	he's told us he isn't sure whether the Osage should be in there	03:40:10PM 3	by check are included in that figure?
03:37:09PM 4	or not. He's told us that he didn't use real disbursement	03:40:12PM 4	A. Yes. I believe all disbursements by check are included in
03:37:12PM 5	numbers. He told us there was no adjustment for the size of	03:40:18PM 5	that figure.
03:37:15PM 6	checks that were not cashed. He told us that, you know, if you	03:40:19PM 6	Q. So if a check was paid to an unsuccessful bidder, it would
03:37:22PM 7	want to get back to what he told us and do redirect on that,	03:40:23PM 7	be included in that figure?
03:37:27PM 8	fine, but to bring back this whole litany of unreliable data to	03:40:24PM 8	A. Yes.
03:37:33PM 9	support the instructions you gave him, I don't buy it, so as far	03:40:24PM 9	Q. And if a check was paid to a tribe, it would be included in
03:37:37PM 10	as I'm concerned	03:40:28PM 10	that figure?
03:37:38PM 11	MR. GINGOLD: I wasn't doing that.	03:40:28PM 11	A. That would be my understanding.
03:37:40PM 12	THE COURT: I can either tune out or you can move	03:40:30PM 12	Q. And even if a check was a fraudulent check, it would be
03:37:43PM 13	on.	03:40:33PM 13	included in that figure, correct?
03:37:43PM 14	MR. GINGOLD: I'm going to move on, your Honor, but	03:40:34PM 14	A. Yes.
03:37:45PM 15	that wasn't the purpose of this being introduced.	03:40:35PM 15	Q. So did you assume that one hundred percent of the checks
03:37:51PM 16	BY MR. GINGOLD:	03:40:39PM 16	were disbursed without regard to whether or not they were paid
03:37:51PM 17	Q. Do you recall Mr. Warshawsky asked you questions about	03:40:44PM 17	to the individual Indian trust beneficiaries?
03:37:55PM 18	funds held outside the Treasury and in banks?	03:40:46PM 18	A. Yes.
03:37:58PM 19	A. Yes.	03:40:47PM 19	Q. And that's the reason you excluded them from your
03:37:58PM 20	Q. And whether or not they're considered in the decisions,	03:40:49PM 20	calculation of benefits conferred, correct?
03:38:03PM 21	borrowing decisions of the Treasury, correct?	03:40:51PM 21	A. Yes.
03:38:05PM 22	A. Yes.	03:40:51PM 22	Q. So there was no assumption that the funds were actually
03:38:08PM 23	Q. And whether or not they should be considered as funds held	03:40:54PM 23	paid to individuals, was there?
03:38:12PM 24	by the Treasury anyway since they're outside the Treasury and	03:40:56PM 24	A. I couldn't prove that, no.
03:38:15PM 25	the banks, do you recall that?	03:40:58PM 25	Q. Well, no evidence has been presented to you in that regard,
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR		Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	377		379
03:38:16PM 1	A. Yes.	03:41:04PM 1	correct?
03:38:17PM 2	Q. I'd like to identify a case, U.S. versus \$277,000 U.S.	03:41:04PM 2	A. Correct. I just know they were paid out of that account.
03:38:30PM 3	currency, and you testified that you're not familiar with budget	03:41:16PM 3	MR. GINGOLD: If I could have one minute, your Honor.
03:38:38PM 4	issues, did you not?	03:41:20PM 4	(There was a pause in the proceedings.)
03:38:39PM 5	A. Not in any real detail.	03:41:29PM 5	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, we have no further
03:38:42PM 6	Q. I'd like to turn to page six of this decision. You did	03:41:30PM 6	questions.
03:38:55PM	listen to Dr. Miller's testimony, correct?	03:41:30PM 7	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Nothing further.
03:38:58PM 8	A. I did.	03:41:31PM 8	THE COURT: If there's nothing further for Professor
10	Q. And your understanding of Dr. Miller's testimony is what?	03:41:34PM 9	Cornell, thank you, sir. That completes your testimony and
03:39:06PM 10 03:39:06PM 11	THE COURT: About everything? MR_GINGOLD: No_With regard to the funds held in	03:41:37PM 10 03:41:38PM 11	you're excused. THE WITNESS: Thank your your Honor
03:39:06PM 11 03:39:10PM 12	MR. GINGOLD: No. With regard to the funds held in banks, not in the Treasury, their use by the Treasury with	03:41:38PM 11 03:41:39PM 12	THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor. (Witness excused at about 3:42 p.m.)
U3:39:1UPM		03:41:39PM 12 03:41:42PM 13	
03:30:1EDM 13	respect to the borrowing decisions or the ability to have		THE COURT: As Lunderstand it we're out of witnesses
03:39:15PM 13	respect to the borrowing decisions or the ability to have control over those funds.		THE COURT: As I understand it, we're out of witnesses for today: is that correct?
03:39:18PM 14	control over those funds.	03:41:44PM 14	for today; is that correct?
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD:	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor.
03:39:18PM 14	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all?	03:41:44PM 14	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated,
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all?	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor.
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16 03:39:22PM 17	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16 03:39:22PM 17 03:39:28PM 18	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:50PM 18	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16 03:39:22PM 17 03:39:22PM 18 03:39:28PM 19	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:56PM 18 03:42:04PM 19	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And then the witness will be who?
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16 03:39:22PM 17 03:39:28PM 18 03:39:29PM 20	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether they were held in commercial banks or at the Treasury. If they	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:50PM 18 03:42:04PM 20	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And then the witness will be who? MR. DORRIS: It will be Mr. Pallais.
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16 03:39:22PM 17 03:39:22PM 18 03:39:29PM 19 03:39:32PM 20 03:39:35PM 21	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether they were held in commercial banks or at the Treasury. If they were not, it's the same thing as well.	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:50PM 18 03:42:04PM 20 03:42:04PM 20	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And then the witness will be who? MR. DORRIS: It will be Mr. Pallais. THE COURT: Mr. Pallais. All right. We're adjourned
03:39:18PM 14 03:39:18PM 15 03:39:20PM 16 03:39:22PM 17 03:39:22PM 18 03:39:22PM 20 03:39:32PM 20 03:39:35PM 21 03:39:40PM 22	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether they were held in commercial banks or at the Treasury. If they were not, it's the same thing as well. Q. It's the same thing from the point of view of an economic	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:50PM 18 03:42:04PM 19 03:42:04PM 20 03:42:10PM 21 03:42:13PM 22	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And then the witness will be who? MR. DORRIS: It will be Mr. Pallais. THE COURT: Mr. Pallais. All right. We're adjourned for the day. Thank you very much, counsel.
03.39.18PM 14 03.39.18PM 15 03.39.20PM 16 03.39.22PM 17 03.39.23PM 18 03.39.23PM 20 03.39.32PM 20 03.39.33PM 21 03.39.40PM 22 03.39.43PM 23	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether they were held in commercial banks or at the Treasury. If they were not, it's the same thing as well. Q. It's the same thing from the point of view of an economic impact, correct?	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:50PM 18 03:42:04PM 20 03:42:04PM 20 03:42:13PM 21 03:42:13PM 22 03:42:17PM 23	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And then the witness will be who? MR. DORRIS: It will be Mr. Pallais. THE COURT: Mr. Pallais. All right. We're adjourned for the day. Thank you very much, counsel.
03.39.18PM 14 03.39.18PM 15 03.39.20PM 16 03.39.22PM 17 03.39.22PM 19 03.39.32PM 20 03.39.35PM 21 03.39.35PM 21 03.39.43PM 22 03.39.43PM 22 03.39.43PM 23	control over those funds. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Do you have an understanding of that at all? A. Well, I think both Dr. Miller and I agreed that the fundamental issue was whether or not those funds were available to the government. And if they were it doesn't matter whether they were held in commercial banks or at the Treasury. If they were not, it's the same thing as well. Q. It's the same thing from the point of view of an economic impact, correct? A. Correct.	03:41:44PM 14 03:41:45PM 15 03:41:47PM 16 03:41:50PM 17 03:41:50PM 19 03:42:04PM 20 03:42:04PM 21 03:42:13PM 21 03:42:13PM 22 03:42:13PM 23 24	for today; is that correct? MR. KIRSCHMAN: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: And tomorrow morning, as I have indicated, we will be dealing with another matter in court and so I think we will reconvene tomorrow afternoon let's say at 1:45. And then the witness will be who? MR. DORRIS: It will be Mr. Pallais. THE COURT: Mr. Pallais. All right. We're adjourned for the day. Thank you very much, counsel.

		380
1	INDEX	
2		
3	WITNESSES:	
4		
5		
6	PROFESSOR BRADFORD CORNELL	
7	Direct Examination by Mr. Gingold	306
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Warshawsky	323
8	Redirect Examination by Mr. Gingold	365
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14 15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Jacqueline M. Sullivan, RPR	
	Official Court Reporter	
		381
1	CERTIFICATE	381
2	CERTIFICATE I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Cou	
2 3		ırt Reporter,
2 3 4	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Cou	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	ırt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct transithe record of proceedings in the above-entitled management of JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN	irt Reporter, script from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I, JACQUELINE M. SULLIVAN, Official Coucertify that the foregoing pages are a correct trans the record of proceedings in the above-entitled ma	irt Reporter, script from

\$	1955 [1] - 317:14 - 1986 [2] - 309:5,	202-585-0053 [1] - 304:24	41.4 [2] - 316:6, 316:7 41st [1] - 351:22	9
	,			
	328:18	202-824-1448 [1] -	423 [4] - 338:23,	
\$200 [1] - 310:23	1987 [2] - 309:20,	304:16	340:21, 341:1,	900 [1] - 304:23
277,000 [1] - 377:2	312:13	202.7 [1] - 346:6	341:10	959.6 [1] - 356:10
3423 [1] - 339:22	1988 [3] - 307:11,	24 [2] - 345:2, 345:4	438 [3] - 344:14,	96-1285 [1] - 304:5
558 [2] - 334:25, 339:5	313:7, 342:24	271.1 [1] - 345:23	344:20, 372:14	975 [1] - 305:13
5700,000 [1] - 314:20	1996 [1] - 370:24	27101 [1] - 305:5	45 [1] - 350:3	98-and-a-half [2] -
5734 [1] - 306:18	1998 [1] - 370:11	272 [3] - 308:17,	48 [1] - 309:9	368:16, 368:17
734.33 [2] - 323:3,	1999 [1] - 356:9	310:18	480 [1] - 353:3	
323:11	1:33 [1] - 304:7	272-00032 [1] - 309:2	4844 [7] - 308:14,	Α
	1:45 [1] - 379:18	278.4 [2] - 345:15,	309:4, 309:10,	
1		346:6	348:8, 348:14,	
	2	2800 [1] - 304:19	349:10, 365:19	a-hundred-and-
		2:03 [1] - 318:20	4844 ALC [1] - 365:14	some [1] - 331:11
20 c (o) 217:14				
20s [2] - 317:14,	9 m 202.4 202.0	2d [1] - 351:22	4th [1] - 370:10	AALC [1] - 308:13
362:1	2 [8] - 363:1, 363:9,		_	aapproximation [1] -
30s [1] - 362:2	364:12, 364:15,	3	5	359:25
	364:16, 364:19,	_		ability [1] - 377:13
1	364:20			able [6] - 312:8,
•	2.2 [1] - 364:5	3.74.5 [1] - 345:15	5 [1] - 328:24	313:15, 316:13,
	2.4 [1] - 338:25	30 [1] - 374:1	5.22 [1] - 358:18	317:13, 365:15,
1.5 [2] - 308:17,	= = =			
	2.46 [3] - 338:12,	30-year [1] - 360:3	5.7 [2] - 338:9, 338:12	371:10
318:18	339:1, 339:2	30309-4530 [1] -	50 [2] - 349:23, 350:3	above-entitled [1] -
1/5 [1] - 335:17	2.7 [1] - 354:17	304:20	52 [1] - 362:25	381:4
10 [1] - 304:7	2.8 [1] - 364:7	306 [1] - 380:7	532 [1] - 351:22	access [2] - 356:24,
10.6 [1] - 341:5	20 [1] - 351:19	30th [3] - 345:9,	55 [2] - 342:23, 342:24	357:9
10.9 [1] - 356:9	2000 [2] - 318:8,	351:20, 356:9	56 [5] - 308:1, 310:7,	accessed [1] - 312:6
1001 [1] - 305:4	358:16	- I		
		31 [2] - 372:20, 372:21	342:8, 342:10,	accomplished [1] -
102 [1] - 362:25	20001 [1] - 305:17	32 [1] - 373:18	347:22	352:23
1099 [1] - 369:6	20005 [3] - 304:16,	323 [1] - 380:7	57 [1] - 327:6	accordance [1] -
1100 [2] - 304:19,	304:24, 305:9	33 [2] - 354:7, 356:9	58 [5] - 318:16,	370:10
305:8	2002 [3] - 307:11,	333 [1] - 305:17	318:19, 335:15,	according [1] - 357:5
126 [1] - 340:5	313:7, 342:24	336-607-7392 [1] -	339:16	account [34] - 308:13
136 [1] - 340:11	2003 [3] - 308:22,	= =	59 [1] - 318:7	308:15, 311:20,
		305:5	55 [i]	
14th [2] - 304:15,	340:3	34 [1] - 374:17		328:10, 328:12,
304:23	2004 [2] - 340:9,	365 [1] - 380:8	6	328:23, 329:8,
14X6039 [2] - 367:16,	340:18	374.5 [1] - 345:25		334:9, 334:11,
367:23	20044 [1] - 305:14	3:42 [2] - 379:12,		334:12, 338:17,
14X63039 [1] - 353:10	2005 [9] - 344:24,	379:23	6 [1] - 309:5	338:20, 339:3,
14X7433 [1] - 353:15	345:9, 345:15,	5.5.25	6.22 [1] - 358:20	339:23, 340:21,
180 [1] - 340:4		4	607 [2] - 304:15,	348:5, 348:11,
	346:4, 358:16,	4		
1887-to-1972 [1] -	358:17, 372:12,		304:23	352:11, 353:18,
336:16	372:17, 374:1		6720 [1] - 305:16	366:25, 367:1,
1907 [1] - 306:21	2006 [10] - 344:24,	4 [1] - 308:22	69.82 [1] - 337:15	367:16, 367:23,
1908 [2] - 313:24,	345:9, 345:15,	4-and-a-half [1] -		367:25, 368:2,
315:23	345:22, 358:16,	335:12	7	368:8, 368:10,
1 909 [3] - 314:2,	358:18, 372:12,	4.22 [2] - 358:17,	•	368:16, 368:17,
				369:3, 369:7, 379:2
314:14, 316:5	372:17, 373:3, 374:1	359:14	7 [0] - 220 7 240 44	
1915 [2] - 338:5, 350:4	2007 [4] - 318:8,	4.42 [1] - 359:14	7 [2] - 338:7, 340:11	accountholders [2] -
1 918 [1] - 350:12	358:17, 358:20,	4.5 [1] - 335:17	7.6 [1] - 354:17	333:2, 345:14
1919 [1] - 350:12	362:19	4.6 [1] - 341:6	7.7 [1] - 354:17	Accounting [1] -
1920 [2] - 350:4,	2008 [2] - 304:7,	4.76 [1] - 359:14	70 [1] - 340:4	308:21
350:11	306:18	404-815-6450 [1] -	70-page [1] - 343:18	accounting [8] -
	202-307-0010 [1] -		75 [1] - 346:7	320:12, 320:14,
1926 [3] - 306:12,		304:20	1 3 [1] = 0 TO.1	
323:3, 342:18	305:9	41 [9] - 307:5, 307:9,	^	324:15, 332:23,
1930s [1] - 358:6	202-307-1104 [1] -	329:12, 330:19,	8	332:24, 333:22,
1934 [1] - 320:24	305:14	330:21, 338:2,		346:14, 347:19
1945 [1] - 332:3	202-354-3187 [1] -	340:2, 358:12,		accounts [17] -
195 [1] - 340:9	305:18	362:19	84 [1] - 351:22	319:21, 321:1,
ט.ט+ט - ווו יייטו	T	00E.10		1

321:6. 328:1. 333:12, 344:9, 351:4, 352:2, 352:3, 352:5, 352:6, 353:18, 356:17, 357:15, 357:23, 357:24 accrew [1] - 354:23 accrued [1] - 316:23 accumulate [1] -319:24 accumulated [3] -317:5, 317:25, 326:14 accurate [4] - 315:14, 315:19, 333:24, 346:16 accurately [1] - 323:4 ACH [3] - 348:21, 348:23, 349:9 acronyms [1] - 348:21 acting [1] - 320:24 action [2] - 369:25, 370:24 Action [1] - 304:5 activity [1] - 334:5 actual [12] - 307:15, 313:7, 314:8, 322:15, 333:24, 337:12, 342:17, 342:25, 349:21, 355:12, 364:10, 364:17 add [1] - 320:1 added [1] - 364:16 additional [1] - 322:19 adds [1] - 315:6 adequate [1] - 373:16 adjourned [2] -379:21, 379:23 adjust [1] - 323:14 adjusted [2] - 310:8, 323:12 adjustment [5] -309:25. 310:1. 311:9, 323:3, 376:5 adjustments [1] -324:7 administative [1] -344:21 admitted [2] - 308:17, 321:16 advantages [2] -337:4, 337:7 **affairs** [1] - 350:2 Affairs [3] - 320:21, 327:19, 374:11 affect [3] - 363:17, 363:19, 363:20 affects [1] - 363:21

affirm [1] - 375:2 AFTERNOON [1] -304:11 afternoon [9] - 306:4, 306:5, 323:19, 323:21, 355:4, 356:3, 356:4, 358:5, 379:18 aggregate [4] -309:17, 364:15, 364:20, 366:2 aggregated [1] -333:16 aggression [1] -336:14 ago [4] - 325:2, 329:16, 329:22, 362:14 agree [3] - 334:20, 349:18, 375:8 agreed [1] - 377:17 ahead [4] - 333:18, 338:1, 344:13, 354:6 aided [1] - 305:22 al [2] - 304:4, 304:7 ALC [1] - 365:19 alleged [1] - 324:14 allocated [2] - 333:17, 369:22 allotted [1] - 350:15 allow [1] - 319:13 allowed [1] - 319:24 almost [2] - 321:17, 374:1 alternatives [1] -357:19 Americans [2] -369:13, 370:15 amount [11] - 309:3, 309:16, 309:17, 312:9, 317:25, 328:14, 328:16, 340:16, 362:20, 368:6 amounts [9] - 312:7, 334:20, 334:21, 334:22, 347:1, 351:3, 352:20, 354:2, 354:11 analogous [1] - 330:7 analogy [1] - 363:14 analysis [10] - 321:8, 323:2, 326:1, 327:20, 331:3,

336:3, 343:19,

361:17

346:10, 361:11,

Angel [1] - 318:17

annual [2] - 312:19,

Andersen [1] - 375:23

316:24 Annual [1] - 318:8 annualize [1] - 312:18 answer [5] - 319:14, 355:9, 361:3, 361:5, 366:13 anyway [2] - 336:19, 376:24 APPEARANCES [3] -304:13, 304:25, 305:1 appeared [1] - 359:16 Apple [1] - 337:2 applied [4] - 362:23, 365:22, 365:23, apply [1] - 371:19 applying [1] - 355:1 approach [6] - 316:12, 321:20, 322:2, 330:3, 359:4, 359:6 appropriate [5] -312:21, 313:6, 323:7, 357:5, 359:21 approximation [4] -312:22, 321:21, 322:4, 362:8 April [1] - 363:14 argued [1] - 315:12 Arthur [1] - 375:23 articles [1] - 329:7 artificially [1] - 349:19 Aside [1] - 326:22 aside [2] - 328:21, 333:1 aspects [2] - 321:24, 371:5 assignment [1] -328:18 assisted [1] - 325:12 assisting [1] - 325:14 associated [1] -325:18 associates [1] -326:24 Associates [1] -318:17 assume [13] - 341:13, 346:20, 346:21, 363:4, 363:5, 366:4, 368:19, 368:21, 368:25, 369:2, 369:4, 369:8, 378:15 Assume [2] - 334:8, 364:1 assumed [4] - 327:24, 338:14, 369:6, 378:2 assumes [1] - 338:14 assuming [4] - 311:6, 347:25, 348:4,

328:2, 339:7, 339:9, 341:17, 341:18, 356:23, 378:22 assumptions [5] -323:8, 323:9, 328:3, 351:7, 369:11 **Atlanta** [1] - 304:20 attached [1] - 329:14 Attachment [44] -306:25, 307:9, 307:23, 308:2, 309:13, 309:19, 309:23, 310:7, 310:12, 310:21, 313:20, 313:23, 314:16, 316:16, 321:20, 321:24, 322:2, 326:17, 328:3, 329:12, 329:14, 329:21, 329:25, 330:2, 330:13, 335:23, 336:2, 337:10, 342:6, 342:21, 345:18, 345:20, 346:18, 347:13, 347:21, 347:22, 347:23, 352:12, 359:17, 361:11, 362:18, 366:8, 366:11 attachment [1] -310:22 attention [5] - 318:22, 320:23, 343:6, 372:20, 374:6 Attorney [1] - 305:11 attorneys [4] - 326:3, 326:4, 326:21, 327:11 attributable [1] -335:1 audit [6] - 344:12, 355:11, 373:13, 373:15, 373:22, 374:4 audited [6] - 344:8, 344:10, 344:11, 345:24, 346:10, 373:17 auditing [1] - 373:23 auditor [2] - 373:9, 373:16 auditors [1] - 375:16 Auditors '[2] - 344:22, 372:10 auditors '[1] - 372:25 audits [1] - 375:23

368:16

assumption [7] -

August [1] - 320:24 automated [1] -348:23 automatically [1] -323:14 available [12] -307:16, 314:8, 329:22, 338:15, 339:7, 339:13, 344:4, 360:2, 362:3, 362:5, 372:4, 377:18 Avenue [1] - 305:17 average [3] - 322:16, 359:23, 359:25 award [1] - 370:13 aware [9] - 342:16, 348:25, 349:6, 352:19, 352:22, 354:1, 354:2, 367:15, 371:11

В

background [2] -325:4, 335:23 backward [1] - 343:14 balance [5] - 316:25, 317:2, 328:25, 338:23, 356:9 balances [3] - 320:9, 345:9, 373:25 bank [8] - 319:21, 356:17, 356:18, 357:6, 357:15, 357:16, 357:22, 357:24 Banking [1] - 318:16 banking [3] - 320:3, 320:10, 332:1 banks [15] - 318:25, 319:5, 319:7, 319:11, 319:18, 320:2, 320:17, 320:20, 356:4, 356:10, 358:3, 376:18, 376:25, 377:12, 377:20 barring [1] - 371:15 Based [1] - 363:3 based [11] - 313:14, 316:13, 319:10, 322:11, 323:1, 323:2, 324:7, 333:2, 333:4, 364:3 **BASED** [1] - 333:4 basis [10] - 307:16, 313:11, 337:5, 341:13, 342:10,

358:7, 358:18,

360:22, 363:6,	bidding [1] - 328:17	306:6, 380:6	375:17	checking [1] - 321:1
370:21	bids [2] - 354:21,	Branch [1] - 305:12	capita [1] - 370:21	checks [34] - 308:13,
Bates [4] - 309:2,	354:22	break [4] - 352:13,	capital [1] - 361:12	309:4, 309:15,
309:9, 318:23, 345:4	big [1] - 355:24	359:19, 364:24,	caption [1] - 350:15	309:17, 310:2,
bear [2] - 337:17,	bigger [1] - 360:18	364:25	captioned [1] - 344:22	310:13, 310:14,
347:12	billion [14] - 328:24,	brief [1] - 329:14	capture [1] - 348:18	310:16, 310:19,
Bear [1] - 347:4	334:25, 335:12,	briefs [1] - 370:16	captured [2] - 309:4,	310:24, 310:25,
became [1] - 352:22	335:15, 335:20,	bring [3] - 350:10,	353:21	311:3, 311:4, 311:6
becides [1] - 336:7	339:5, 341:4, 341:5,	369:24, 376:8	careful [1] - 335:8	311:7, 311:14,
become [4] - 333:7,	341:6, 364:5, 364:6,	brought [2] - 343:6,	carefully [2] - 344:6,	311:18, 311:24,
352:19, 354:1, 362:9	364:7	373:6	371:7	312:4, 312:7, 312:8
BEFORE [1] - 304:11	billions [2] - 363:7,	budget [1] - 377:3	Carolina [1] - 305:5	322:21, 347:9,
beg [1] - 342:2	363:8	Buffett [1] - 328:18	case [14] - 324:25,	349:2, 349:3, 352:4
begin [1] - 314:2	binders [1] - 326:15	builds [4] - 338:19,	325:3, 325:8,	357:22, 365:19,
beginning [3] -	bit [8] - 306:20,	339:11, 340:20,	325:24, 327:13,	367:25, 368:9,
316:25, 317:2,	350:10, 351:25,	341:10	333:10, 333:15,	368:13, 376:6,
318:24	355:3, 357:21,	built [2] - 338:17,	334:15, 337:10,	378:15
begins [1] - 373:21	362:7, 363:21,	339:3	343:13, 355:20,	choices [1] - 361:24
behalf [1] - 345:14	363:22	Bureau [2] - 320:21,	357:19, 361:23,	chose [2] - 357:8,
belief [1] - 333:23	bits [1] - 372:4	374:11	377:2	369:24
below [1] - 317:25	black [1] - 308:4	buy [1] - 376:9	cashed [8] - 310:3,	CHRISTOPHER [1] -
Ben [1] - 305:13	blanks [2] - 336:4,	BY [26] - 306:9, 307:7,	310:17, 310:20,	305:7
beneficiaries [10] -	336:17	308:23, 315:22,	310:25, 311:6,	chunk [1] - 355:24
340:24, 340:25,	blow [2] - 345:3,	318:21, 319:15,	311:15, 311:18,	circumstances [2] -
341:14, 341:15,	351:24	320:8, 320:16,	376:6	352:19, 368:11
342:12, 342:13,	Blow [1] - 351:24	321:19, 323:18,	cashing [1] - 311:8	citation [1] - 351:21
349:2, 365:18,	board [2] - 366:1,	337:22, 339:25,	categories [2] -	citing [1] - 352:6
370:10, 378:17	371:19	344:18, 355:15,	350:15, 350:19	Civil [2] - 304:5,
benefit [33] - 316:17,	bond [5] - 317:3,	356:1, 359:7,	centers [1] - 320:24	305:12
316:24, 317:5,	327:2, 359:20,	365:11, 367:9,	cents [6] - 311:7,	claim [1] - 320:13
319:6, 319:8,	361:14, 361:24	367:14, 369:16,	341:13, 341:23,	claimed [1] - 343:7
319:12, 319:17,	bonded [1] - 356:10	370:3, 370:16,	341:25, 342:3,	claims [1] - 371:8
319:22, 320:1,	bonds [1] - 360:3	371:14, 373:8,	342:11	clarified [1] - 323:25
320:4, 320:19,	borrow [14] - 360:15,	376:16, 377:15	certainly [1] - 331:17	class [5] - 330:11,
321:7, 321:21,	360:23, 360:24,		CERTIFICATE [1] -	333:7, 370:5, 370:8
322:20, 323:4,	360:25, 361:4,	С	381:1	370:14
323:9, 324:13,	361:5, 362:11,		certify [1] - 381:3	clear [5] - 331:21,
331:2, 331:5, 331:7,				
	363:7, 364:2, 364:4,	O D A 070.44	change [3] - 323:13,	334:3, 355:2,
340:22, 341:7,	364:6, 364:7	C.P.A [1] - 373:11	change [3] - 323:13, 324:21, 361:18	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20
341:9, 341:11,		calculate [2] - 316:20,		334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4,	364:6, 364:7	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5	324:21, 361:18	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] -	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11,
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] -	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] -	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1,
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] -	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] -
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25,
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2, 352:9, 361:4	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13 bottom [9] - 306:18,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3, 339:15, 344:5,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23, 312:25, 313:9,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2, 352:9, 361:4 between [5] - 335:1,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13 bottom [9] - 306:18, 322:10, 323:14,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3, 339:15, 344:5, 353:21, 355:4,	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23, 312:25, 313:9, 321:3, 331:3, 349:5,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21 collateral [1] - 321:11 collect [1] - 333:7
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2, 352:9, 361:4 between [5] - 335:1, 335:11, 335:16,	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13 bottom [9] - 306:18, 322:10, 323:14, 324:21, 334:25,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3, 339:15, 344:5, 353:21, 355:4, 356:23, 378:20	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23, 312:25, 313:9, 321:3, 331:3, 349:5, 359:19, 363:15,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21 collateral [1] - 321:17 collect [1] - 333:7
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2, 352:9, 361:4 between [5] - 335:1, 335:11, 335:16, 338:12, 350:18	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13 bottom [9] - 306:18, 322:10, 323:14, 324:21, 334:25, 335:4, 336:16,	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3, 339:15, 344:5, 353:21, 355:4, 356:23, 378:20 calculations [3] -	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23, 312:25, 313:9, 321:3, 331:3, 349:5, 359:19, 363:15, 367:15, 367:17,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21 collateral [1] - 321:17 collect [1] - 333:7 collected [7] - 333:24
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2, 352:9, 361:4 between [5] - 335:1, 335:11, 335:16, 338:12, 350:18 beyond [1] - 369:10	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13 bottom [9] - 306:18, 322:10, 323:14, 324:21, 334:25, 335:4, 336:16, 338:5, 345:4	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3, 339:15, 344:5, 353:21, 355:4, 356:23, 378:20 calculations [3] - 307:1, 314:1, 358:10	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23, 312:25, 313:9, 321:3, 331:3, 349:5, 359:19, 363:15, 367:15, 367:17, 367:19, 367:22,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21 collateral [1] - 321:17 collect [1] - 333:7 collected [7] - 333:24 340:14, 340:24,
341:9, 341:11, 354:23, 355:4, 357:11, 357:16, 366:24, 369:17, 369:21, 370:20 benefits [5] - 317:7, 322:3, 330:10, 330:12, 378:20 Bert [1] - 308:20 best [3] - 321:20, 322:4, 332:19 better [4] - 307:2, 352:9, 361:4 between [5] - 335:1, 335:11, 335:16, 338:12, 350:18 beyond [1] - 369:10 bidder [1] - 378:6	364:6, 364:7 borrowed [1] - 339:20 borrower [3] - 317:10, 317:14, 317:20 borrowing [17] - 317:23, 359:22, 359:25, 360:6, 360:12, 360:20, 361:13, 362:8, 363:6, 363:9, 363:17, 364:13, 364:17, 364:19, 376:21, 377:13 bottom [9] - 306:18, 322:10, 323:14, 324:21, 334:25, 335:4, 336:16, 338:5, 345:4 bounds [1] - 375:10	calculate [2] - 316:20, 364:5 calculated [10] - 307:24, 313:21, 313:24, 330:23, 332:6, 333:18, 334:1, 335:16, 342:5, 362:21 calculation [17] - 306:16, 306:17, 307:17, 307:19, 308:2, 330:6, 331:9, 334:21, 334:23, 334:24, 335:3, 339:15, 344:5, 353:21, 355:4, 356:23, 378:20 calculations [3] -	324:21, 361:18 changed [1] - 329:23 changes [2] - 307:1, 345:8 Changes [1] - 332:3 characteristic [1] - 311:14 Charles [3] - 308:18, 325:20, 325:21 chart [1] - 315:6 Check [1] - 347:19 check [22] - 311:9, 311:25, 312:23, 312:25, 313:9, 321:3, 331:3, 349:5, 359:19, 363:15, 367:15, 367:17, 367:19, 367:22, 368:3, 378:3, 378:4,	334:3, 355:2, 371:12, 374:20 cleared [1] - 367:18 clearing [2] - 320:11, 348:23 close [1] - 339:4 closed [2] - 321:1, 321:6 co [1] - 337:21 co-counsel [1] - 337:21 Cobell [3] - 324:25, 351:19, 371:1 COBELL [1] - 304:3 coffers [1] - 340:21 collateral [1] - 321:17 collect [1] - 333:7 collected [7] - 333:24 340:14, 340:24, 341:14, 342:12,

COLUMBIA [1] - 304:1	computer [3] - 305:22,	conversations [1] -	324:8, 332:9, 338:8,	320:13, 321:10,
Column [31] - 308:12,	308:5, 312:5	333:22	339:21, 341:8,	321:13, 321:17,
309:23, 310:8,	computer -aided [1] -	Conversations [1] -	350:8, 362:24,	323:16, 337:20,
310:10, 310:11,	305:22	332:12	368:7, 371:21,	339:16, 344:17,
310:12, 310:13,	computing [1] - 322:2	coordinator [1] -	373:10, 373:12,	355:6, 355:20,
311:3, 313:21,	con't [2] - 304:25,	308:19	377:24, 379:2	355:25, 359:6,
314:3, 314:16,	305:1	copy [3] - 344:15,	Corrected [1] - 346:24	364:25, 365:2,
314:22, 315:6,	concerned [2] -	345:21, 359:5	corrected [23] -	365:7, 367:6,
315:7, 315:9,	321:18, 376:10	CORNELL [2] - 306:6,	307:21, 310:10,	367:11, 369:11,
315:13, 315:17,	conclude [1] - 365:15	380:6	310:12, 314:3,	370:1, 370:4, 370:7
316:23, 317:4,	concluded [1] -	Cornell [14] - 306:10,	314:4, 314:16,	370:12, 370:22,
317:5, 334:20,	371:11	308:3, 308:6,	315:4, 315:5,	371:3, 373:7,
335:2, 338:5, 347:5,	conclusion [2] -	309:11, 323:19,	315:17, 316:7,	374:24, 375:1,
347:23, 358:11,	342:11, 349:21	324:22, 324:24,	330:24, 332:6,	375:18, 375:22, 376:12, 377:10,
358:12 column [7] - 307:10,	condition [4] - 374:9,	326:12, 344:19,	333:19, 334:20,	379:8, 379:13,
307:11, 316:16,	374:10, 374:13,	350:1, 356:2, 365:4,	335:11, 335:16, 340:4, 341:3,	379:16, 379:21
333:19, 358:13,	374:18	365:12, 379:9 Cornell's [1] - 369:10	341:25, 342:3,	Courthouse [1] -
359:11, 359:12	confer [1] - 365:1	corner [2] - 345:5,	346:25, 362:19	305:16
Columns [1] - 334:4	conferred [13] - 319:8,	354:10	corrects [1] - 333:20	COURTROOM [1] -
columns [5] - 315:3,	319:12, 319:17,	correct [71] - 306:19,	corresponded [1] -	306:2
330:21, 330:24,	319:23, 321:8, 321:21, 322:3,	307:12, 307:24,	326:3	cover [1] - 308:14
332:6	323:4, 323:9,	312:9, 313:9,	corrupt [1] - 357:18	CPNR [23] - 307:15,
comfortable [1] -	369:17, 369:21,	313:18, 313:25,	cost [3] - 339:18,	309:4, 309:5,
374:15	370:20, 378:20	314:5, 314:17,	361:12, 361:13	309:10, 310:8,
coming [3] - 328:11,	confirm [1] - 341:2	315:24, 316:10,	costs [2] - 360:12,	311:22, 312:13,
363:1, 364:6	confirmed [1] - 371:17	320:18, 321:8,	362:8	322:11, 322:13,
commercial [3] -	conform [1] - 372:25	322:2, 322:13,	counsel [15] - 313:15,	322:14, 322:16,
319:7, 319:18,	connection [4] -	323:6, 323:12,	326:8, 326:23,	329:22, 341:19,
377:20	325:8, 325:23,	323:22, 324:10,	327:16, 328:4,	341:22, 343:15,
Commercial [1] -	327:20, 355:5	327:16, 327:17,	329:15, 330:5,	347:16, 347:18,
305:12	consider [4] - 335:14,	327:20, 329:9,	332:12, 333:22,	348:1, 348:13,
commissioner [1] -	360:6, 363:13,	332:8, 333:19,	337:21, 343:6,	349:8, 349:17,
350:2	374:12	334:16, 334:17,	371:18, 371:22,	353:22, 372:7
Commissioner [1] -	consideration [2] -	335:25, 338:5,	372:3, 379:22	CRA [7] - 325:16,
327:19	361:16, 374:8	340:13, 341:1,	count [2] - 316:10,	325:21, 326:5,
committed [1] - 361:7	considered [4] -	342:7, 342:9,	316:11	326:25, 327:9,
company [4] - 325:17,	322:20, 358:1,	342:14, 346:2,	couple [5] - 317:14,	349:6, 365:16
325:19, 344:11	376:20, 376:23	348:1, 348:18,	322:5, 329:16,	credit [4] - 318:1,
comparable [2] -	Constitution [1] -	348:19, 352:16,	329:21, 335:22	356:11, 356:20,
313:2, 313:4	305:17	352:17, 353:20,	course [2] - 332:15,	357:10
compare [2] - 345:21,	consultant [1] -	353:24, 357:12,	362:16	critical [3] - 319:19,
347:13	325:19	360:15, 362:23,	Court [11] - 305:15,	330:24, 356:18
comparing [2] - 346:6,	containing [1] - 352:6	363:2, 364:14,	305:16, 306:10,	crook [1] - 331:13
358:24	context [1] - 326:13	365:25, 366:9,	306:23, 306:24,	cross [1] - 337:18
compensating [1] -	continually [1] -	368:6, 369:20,	318:24, 321:16,	CROSS [1] - 323:17
320:9	360:16	370:3, 370:6,	346:15, 370:17,	Cross [1] - 380:7
complete [2] - 311:16,	continued [1] - 358:6	372:18, 372:22,	370:19, 381:2	cross-examination
315:14	continuing [1] - 306:9	373:3, 373:9, 373:11, 374:4,	court [5] - 328:8,	- 337:18
completes [1] - 379:9	continuously [1] -	375:4, 375:9,	328:11, 369:25, 371:10, 379:17	Cross-Examination
complex [2] - 343:19,	362:4	376:21, 377:7,	COURT [52] - 304:1,	[1] - 380:7
364:18	control [3] - 374:8,	377:23, 378:13,	306:5, 307:3,	CROSS- EXAMINATION [1] -
compliance [1] -	374:22, 377:14	378:20, 379:1,	310:19, 310:22,	323:17
373:1	controller [1] - 320:25	379:14, 379:15,	311:5, 311:11,	cummulated [1] -
complicated [1] -	controls [1] - 374:16	381:3	315:2, 315:11,	317:6
361:2	convenience [1] -	Correct [20] - 306:20,	315:20, 317:9,	
component [2] -	352:4	310:16, 312:10,	317:16, 317:24,	curing [1] - 320:13 currency [1] - 377:3
315:16	conversation [3] -	313:19, 314:1,	318:5, 318:9,	current [1] - 347:14
			J.J.J, J.J.J,	
compounding [1] - 306:22	313:14, 330:4, 343:16	314:6, 314:18,	319:13, 320:6,	cut [3] - 310:24,

367:15, 368:9	days [1] - 354:25	368:14	310:24, 312:25,	308:18, 309:1,
	dealing [4] - 306:25,	destroyed [1] - 332:4	313:5, 313:12,	309:8, 314:4,
D	313:13, 371:18,	detail [2] - 330:8,	322:12, 322:16,	326:12, 327:13,
	379:17	377:5	337:15, 337:23,	328:25, 329:16,
	dealt [1] - 312:24	detailed [4] - 333:21,	339:13, 342:25,	344:25, 345:2,
D.C [6] - 304:6,	debt [9] - 317:12,	343:19, 346:13,	343:8, 343:9,	351:23, 353:7,
304:16, 304:24,	317:13, 317:25,	355:11	343:21, 343:22,	358:5, 358:8
305:9, 305:14,	327:4, 328:19,	details [1] - 349:6	344:4, 346:10,	documents [13] -
305:17	329:5, 360:18,	determination [3] -	347:5, 349:19,	326:4, 326:5,
D1100034 [1] - 318:24	361:9, 361:14	311:13, 312:8,	353:21, 354:11,	326:15, 326:16,
damage [1] - 331:5	Debt [2] - 318:7, 318:8	370:17	355:17, 357:19,	326:18, 326:22,
damaged [1] - 371:9	debter [1] - 317:11	determinations [1] -	365:22, 372:4,	326:24, 327:8,
damages [4] - 330:7,	debunked [1] - 354:24	363:7	375:13, 376:1,	327:15, 327:22,
330:11, 369:24,	decide [2] - 330:3,	determine [2] -	376:4, 378:1	332:3, 332:13,
371:8	332:7	312:22, 359:20	disbursements [43] -	342:20
DANIEL [1] - 305:3	decided [1] - 330:18	develop [1] - 346:14	307:21, 307:24,	dollar [7] - 309:16,
Data [1] - 358:22	decision [10] - 330:21,	developed [1] -	310:8, 311:25,	311:7, 320:6,
data [73] - 307:2,	363:10, 363:17,	330:15	312:23, 313:8,	341:14, 341:23,
307:15, 307:17,	364:2, 364:11,	difference [8] -	316:19, 321:2,	342:4, 342:12
308:10, 310:14,	364:13, 364:17,	329:20, 335:1,	322:8, 322:18,	dollar-and-a-quarter
311:16, 311:22,	375:6, 375:7, 377:6	335:11, 335:16,	322:19, 324:18,	[1] - 311:7
312:13, 312:18,	decision -making [1] -	338:11, 338:13,	324:20, 331:1,	dollars [6] - 311:8,
312:19, 312:20,	364:11	338:15, 346:5	331:6, 331:9,	332:23, 335:20,
312:23, 312:25,	decisions [8] -	different [7] - 329:18,	335:11, 338:9,	341:4, 346:1, 364:5
313:3, 313:8,	324:19, 360:6,	334:4, 334:7,	340:5, 341:5,	done [10] - 306:15,
313:14, 313:16,	360:20, 360:22,	348:17, 356:16,	342:17, 342:19, 343:5, 343:7,	315:14, 324:16,
313:17, 314:8,	362:10, 376:20,	358:25, 372:2		329:7, 330:6,
314:10, 314:12,	376:21, 377:13	differently [1] - 360:21	345:14, 345:17, 345:22, 347:6,	330:14, 334:24,
314:15, 314:23,	decrease [1] - 322:21	diminimus [1] - 312:9	347:15, 347:24,	335:25, 337:13,
315:9, 315:13,	Decreases [1] -	DIRECT [1] - 306:8	348:6, 348:18,	346:14
315:19, 315:24,	345:14	Direct [1] - 380:7	349:1, 354:15,	door [2] - 375:16,
316:3, 316:5, 316:12, 322:11,	defendants [1] -	direct [8] - 320:18,	354:20, 355:23,	375:24
322:14, 322:15,	306:24	320:19, 327:7,	357:22, 358:1,	DORRIS [2] - 304:18,
322:17, 322:19,	Defendants [2] -	331:14, 334:2,	362:21, 378:2, 378:4	379:20
324:7, 327:2,	304:8, 305:6	338:23, 341:18,	disbursing [3] - 348:8,	double [3] - 316:10,
329:22, 331:23,	Defendants ' [5] -	356:8	348:17, 357:5	316:11, 371:16 down [10] - 311:21,
333:24, 336:7,	344:14, 344:20,	directly [11] - 307:18,	discount [1] - 311:1	317:13, 317:20,
337:6, 337:12,	353:3, 354:7, 356:8	309:24, 310:11,	discretion [1] - 370:18	317:23, 317:25,
341:19, 342:17,	defined [1] - 334:17	319:7, 326:3, 327:5,	discussed [1] - 356:7	350:10, 350:12,
342:25, 343:9,	definition [2] - 351:7,	327:10, 333:11,	discussing [1] - 352:2	353:15, 370:24,
343:13, 343:14,	357:19	334:11, 346:22,	discussion [3] -	371:1
343:17, 344:4,	delta [1] - 355:21	359:23	319:4, 330:7, 355:5	dozen [1] - 326:14
344:6, 347:15,	delved [1] - 328:5	director [1] - 308:20	disputed [1] - 361:22	DR [1] - 306:6
347:16, 348:1,	DENNIS [1] - 304:14	DIRK [1] - 304:7	distinction [1] -	Dr [14] - 306:10, 308:3
348:13, 348:18,	Dennis [1] - 304:14	disappears [2] -	350:18	308:6, 309:11,
349:8, 349:17,	Department [6] -	340:21, 342:12	distribute [1] - 370:20	326:10, 328:9,
349:21, 353:23,	305:8, 305:11,	disburse [1] - 340:18	distributed [4] -	329:3, 340:17,
355:14, 361:15,	308:8, 308:19,	disbursed [17] -	342:13, 349:7,	361:4, 362:16,
362:3, 362:5, 366:2,	323:20, 372:24	319:21, 320:20,	370:14, 370:18	371:17, 377:7,
372:1, 372:4, 372:7,	deposit [2] - 318:25,	321:7, 334:11,	DISTRICT [3] - 304:1,	377:9, 377:17
375:4, 376:8	357:6	339:10, 339:24,	304:1, 304:12	draw [2] - 349:21,
data-fishing [1] -	deposited [2] -	340:15, 340:17,	divide [2] - 318:11,	357:23
337:6	352:11, 358:3	340:25, 341:23,	362:25	drawn [5] - 309:24,
database [4] - 312:5,	deposits [1] - 354:3	342:1, 342:4, 355:8,	Division [1] - 305:12	311:21, 357:22,
312:13, 322:13,	depressing [2] -	357:17, 365:16,	doctor [1] - 324:22	357:25, 358:2
365:16	318:9, 318:11	365:20, 378:16	Doctor [1] - 324:23	dumped [1] - 339:2
dated [3] - 308:21,	DEPUTY [1] - 306:2	disbursement [34] -	document [18] -	duplicative [1] -
341:22, 373:3	describe [1] - 330:1	306:12, 306:19,	306:19, 308:3,	337:18
DAVID [1] - 305:3	described [3] -	307:10, 307:11,	308:6, 308:7,	during [3] - 325:11,
	310:14, 368:11,	308:2, 309:22,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

356:8, 359:19 325:8, 325:23 Excuse [1] - 312:3 extra [1] - 364:3 378:7, 378:10, 378:13 **DX** [4] - 308:17, entered [1] - 366:14 excused [2] - 379:10, extraordinarly [1] -310:18, 340:2 379:12 figures [7] - 344:8, entire [2] - 362:3, 331:20 DX438 [2] - 372:9, 374.1 346:10, 346:16, **executive** [1] - 308:20 extrapolate [1] -346:25, 350:7, 372:20 entirely [1] - 319:22 Exhibit [24] - 308:1, 343:14 entitled [4] - 318:16, extrapolated [1] -351:5, 359:16 309:3, 309:9, 318:7, Ε 333:7, 369:13, 381:4 318:16, 318:19, 313:16 filed [4] - 321:15, entity [1] - 360:16 329:12, 330:19, extrapolation [1] -329:15, 370:24, entry [1] - 352:24 330:21, 340:2, 313:11 371:5 early [2] - 315:25, fill [2] - 336:4, 336:7 envelope [1] - 335:8 342:23, 342:24, extreme [1] - 357:15 358:6 344:14, 344:20, filled [1] - 336:17 equally [1] - 370:14 earned [4] - 316:25, 347:22, 349:23, finance [2] - 320:21, **ESQ** [11] - 304:14, 317:1, 332:10, 350:3, 353:3, 354:7, 328:17 304:17, 304:18, 332:14 356:8, 358:12, 304:21. 304:22. Financial [2] - 308:19, earnedd [1] - 354:23 362:18 fact [18] - 310:2, 372:11 305:3, 305:3, 305:6, easier [1] - 349:25 311:2, 334:19, exhibit [7] - 308:17, financial [12] - 319:16, 305:7, 305:7, 305:10 easily [2] - 313:18, 335:9, 336:5, 318:10, 318:23, 321:25, 322:1, estimate [3] - 316:8, 363.8 320:24, 353:4, 343:20, 348:16, 330:13, 346:12, 322:10, 343:3 349:17, 351:3, easy [1] - 352:4 357:21, 375:12 372:25, 373:22, et [2] - 304:3, 304:7 357:9, 360:18, economic [5] exhibits [1] - 326:17 373:25, 374:8, eventually [2] -319:12, 319:16, exists [1] - 372:1 365:13, 365:18, 374:12, 374:15, 319:24, 328:2 368:15, 368:24, 319:19, 321:25, **Expected** [1] - 360:12 374:22 evidence [12] -369:19, 370:23, 377:22 expenditure [1] financing [1] - 328:19 321:16, 323:10, economics [1] -372:13 fine [2] - 337:25, 376:8 319:25 324:18, 331:8, factors [2] - 360:5, 330:13 expenditures [1] first [17] - 307:8, 331:14, 331:18, 360:11 economist [2] - 322:1, 331:21, 341:19, 320:21 309:3, 312:24, facts [1] - 330:22 346:13 **experience** [1] - 325:4 314:14, 324:17, 365:19, 365:24, Edwards [1] - 308:20 factual [1] - 341:12 expert [1] - 333:21 324:24, 328:25, 378:25 failed [2] - 341:23, effect [1] - 306:11 330:4, 330:20, expertise [1] - 369:10 exact [1] - 313:4 effectively [1] - 338:14 342:25 332:23, 338:2, exactly [3] - 325:9, experts [1] - 326:9 Fair [2] - 327:14, efforts [2] - 322:7, 346:19, 350:11, explain [5] - 306:11, 355:2, 356:22 362:9 346:17 353:6, 360:9, 315:3, 316:1, Exactly [1] - 348:23 fair [4] - 327:24, **EFT** [2] - 348:21, 373:21, 374:7 Examination [3] -336:25, 367:10 328:14, 347:24, 349:9 fiscal [4] - 340:3, 380:7, 380:7, 380:8 explained [5] -351:5 344:24, 372:11, eighteen [1] - 309:8 **EXAMINATION** [3] -308:15, 324:14, fairness [1] - 373:24 372:17 either [6] - 318:4, 306:8, 323:17, 330:10, 347:15, 337:14, 357:17, familiar [9] - 329:15, fishing [1] - 337:6 365:10 371:13 345:1, 348:7, five [5] - 307:22, 359:3, 361:1, 376:12 explanation [1] examination [2] -348:20, 348:24, 311:7. 317:8. **Electronic** [1] - 348:22 334:3, 337:18 315:8 350:25, 360:5, 377:3 320:25, 336:9 electronic [4] explanatory [2] examined [1] - 326:6 familiarity [1] - 328:14 flips [1] - 361:20 349:11, 349:12, example [20] - 320:22, 337:3, 337:8 famous [1] - 363:11 float [1] - 326:4 349:14, 349:17 explicitly [1] - 316:3 322:7, 322:21, far [4] - 321:18, **Floor** [1] - 304:15 electronically [2] exponential [1] -324:17, 326:8, 331:23, 369:10, 349:2, 349:4 flow [1] - 334:15 327:18, 328:22, 336:15 376:9 eleven [1] - 335:20 329:22, 330:23, expression [1] flowed [1] - 334:22 faudulently [1] - 331:4 flows [1] - 364:17 eleven-plus [1] -334:7, 340:3, 344:3, 351:12 February [1] - 370:10 focus [2] - 353:6, 335:20 344:13, 345:21, extend [1] - 373:23 felt [1] - 362:7 373:20 **ELLIOTT** [1] - 304:17 349:6, 352:14, extensive [2] - 319:4, 354:6, 356:7, 360:3, few [1] - 317:15 focused [1] - 336:16 eloquently [1] -330:4 351:18 361:10 extensively [1] - 326:4 fifteen [2] - 312:19, follow [1] - 324:3 341:3 **ELOUISE** [1] - 304:3 Excel [1] - 306:24 extent [15] - 323:10, follow-up [1] - 324:3 fifteen-plus [1] - 341:3 elsewhere [1] - 363:24 Except [3] - 338:17, 324:18, 326:2, following [1] - 374:9 338:19, 339:11 fifth [1] - 359:12 embarrassed [1] -328:6, 338:17, follows [1] - 351:7 except [3] - 320:25, 338:18, 338:19, fifty [1] - 325:9 335.9 footnote [1] - 347:23 encompassed [1] -338:18, 340:20 339:11, 340:20, figure [15] - 307:11, footnotes [1] - 346:20 315:4, 341:5, 347:25 excerpted [1] - 318:23 347:24, 351:6, FOR [2] - 304:1, 306:6 end [2] - 338:22, 362:6 exchange [2] - 324:3, 352:14, 363:23, 343:21. 343:22. foregoing [1] - 381:3 370:21. 371:9 345:22. 346:23. ended [1] - 345:9 356:3 forget [2] - 342:8, 347:5, 352:15, external [2] - 338:17, endorsed [1] - 371:1 excluded [2] - 309:20, 363:18 378:2, 378:3, 378:5, 338:19 378:19 engagement [2] form [1] - 322:13

forming [1] - 327:24 318:18. 319:8. 355:1, 359:5 Holocaust [1] - 332:2 G 319:17, 319:23, HARPER [1] - 304:21 forms [1] - 369:7 home [1] - 308:5 319:24, 320:1, forth [3] - 320:12, headright [4] - 334:13, Honor [28] - 306:4, 320:11, 320:19, 326:5, 332:25 347:6, 347:25, 310:21, 315:8, gage [1] - 359:21 320:20, 321:15, 348:16 foundation [1] - 319:9 gained [1] - 332:15 318:6, 318:14, 321:21. 322:3. headrights [1] - 370:7 four [5] - 307:8, GAO [2] - 329:2, 329:5 320:15, 321:15, 323:5, 324:7, 309:23, 336:9, gas [3] - 332:21, hear [4] - 319:14, 323:15, 337:17, 326:16. 328:19. 343:5, 359:12 333:12, 333:15 324:17, 324:19, 344:15. 347:12. 330:10, 330:12, Fourth [1] - 305:4 369:12 359:4, 359:5, gather [2] - 329:7, 331:3, 331:5, 331:7, 364:24, 365:6, fraction [2] - 311:4, 331:17 heard [9] - 328:9, 332:5, 334:1, 367:9, 369:9, general [14] - 319:7, 328:11, 328:21, 341:11 338:15, 339:8, 369:16, 370:19, 333:1, 336:19, framework [1] - 330:5 320:25, 328:10, 339:16, 339:17, 371:2, 371:4, 373:5. 348:7, 349:13, Franklin [1] - 305:13 328:12, 328:23, 339:23, 340:22, 375:20, 376:14, fraud [2] - 331:8. 329:8. 348:4. 351:12, 375:1 341:7, 341:9, 379:3, 379:5, hearing [1] - 344:21 331:18 362:14, 367:24, 341:15, 354:23, 379:11, 379:15 hearsay [2] - 321:11, 367:25, 368:2, fraudulent [1] -355:5, 356:16, HONORABLE [1] -321:12 368:10, 368:12, 378:12 356:24, 357:2, held [34] - 318:3, 304:11 375:22 free [4] - 320:2, 320:3, 357:4, 357:7, 357:9, gentleman 's [1] -318:25, 319:5, hotly [1] - 361:22 356:24, 357:9 357:11, 357:14, 319:6, 319:11, hours [1] - 325:7 375:25 front [2] - 346:4, 357:17, 359:22, 319:17, 319:20, house [1] - 348:23 Georgia [1] - 304:20 346:20 359:25, 360:3, GINGOLD [42] -319:21, 319:23, hundred [15] - 310:24, full [1] - 312:19 360:8, 360:17, 320:4, 356:4, 356:5, 325:10, 331:11, 304:14, 306:4, fully [1] - 353:25 361:7, 361:8, 356:10, 356:15, 331:25, 335:17, 306:9. 306:23. fund [2] - 345:8, 362:10, 362:20, 357:10, 366:4, 339:3, 339:4, 307:5. 307:7. 373:25 363:1, 363:5, 366:7, 366:16, 340:15, 346:1, 308:16, 308:23, fund's [1] - 373:25 363:15, 363:17, 366:20, 366:21, 357:20, 358:18, 310:21, 311:12, fundamental [1] -363:20, 364:1, 366:23, 367:2, 359:24, 361:16, 315:22, 318:6, 377:18 364:22, 369:2, 367:16, 368:2, 363:19, 378:15 318:13, 318:21, funds [61] - 318:25, 369:6, 369:17, 368:8, 368:15, hyphen [1] - 333:4 319:12, 319:15, 319:5, 319:6, 372:8, 377:19 368:17, 369:3, 320:8, 320:15, hypothetical [7] -319:17, 320:2, government's [6] -369:7, 369:15, 320:16, 321:15, 334:8, 357:15, 320:17, 320:20, 322:7, 324:13, 376:18, 376:23, 365:13, 367:22, 321:19, 323:15, 321:2, 321:6, 323:5, 324:14, 324:18, 377:11, 377:20 368:3, 368:11, 365:9. 365:11. 324:14, 338:24, 335:2, 362:8 help [2] - 346:15, 370:13 367:9. 369:16. 345:11, 348:22, government -370:3, 370:6, 370:9, 351:18 hypothetically [1] -355:8, 357:5, 357:7, calculated [1] -Herschlifer [3] -370:16, 371:4, 310:23 357:10, 357:24, 334:1 326:19, 326:20, 371:14, 374:25, hypotheticals [1] -357:25, 365:14, great [1] - 328:16 326:22 375:11, 375:20, 366:3 365:15, 365:20, Greek [1] - 363:11 hesitating [1] - 347:8 376:11, 376:14, 366:4, 366:7, 366:8, Gringold [1] - 358:8 376:16, 377:11, high [5] - 328:7, ı 366:14, 366:16, GRINGOLD [4] -377:15, 379:3, 379:5 332:18, 332:19, 367:2, 367:15, 367:14, 370:23, Gingold [8] - 304:14, 355:13, 362:6 367:17, 367:20, 373:5, 373:8 idea [2] - 321:13, 315:2, 324:4, 354:9, high-level [1] - 332:19 367:24, 368:1, guess [2] - 332:7, 330:23 356:4, 374:24, higher [2] - 306:20, 368:8, 368:9, 380:7, 380:8 351:2 357:21 identification [2] -368:15, 368:17, **GUILDER** [1] - 304:22 given [4] - 323:7, highlighted [6] -318:15, 318:20 368:18, 368:19, 340:14, 342:11, 307:10, 309:22, identified [15] - 309:2, 368:20, 368:21, Н 309:9, 309:10, 370:5 313:24, 314:5, 368:22, 368:24, **GNP** [1] - 337:1 320:23, 352:1 310:15, 312:7, 368:25, 369:3, 314:15, 316:16, government [82] highly [1] - 372:5 369:4, 369:7, 369:8, half [3] - 311:8, 353:6, 316:23, 318:7, 370:17, 370:20, 313:21, 313:24, hired [2] - 324:24, 364:4 322:22, 372:9, 314:1, 314:14, 325:3 372:23, 373:22, hand [7] - 345:5, 374:9, 374:18, 315:4, 315:9, 376:18, 376:23, historian [1] - 328:4 350:7, 350:11, 375:12, 375:13 315:15, 315:17, Historical [2] - 308:21, 377:11, 377:14, 353:9, 353:14, identify [3] - 308:16, 315:23, 316:3, 377:18, 378:22 318:8 354:10, 356:9 318:7, 377:2 316:6, 316:8, Funds [4] - 344:23, historical [2] - 326:15, 316:17, 317:3, happy [2] - 324:1, ignore [1] - 339:22 372:10, 372:11 327:15 369:12 IIM [36] - 314:20, 317:10, 317:18, history [1] - 331:24 hard [3] - 345:21, 314:23, 318:16, 317:19, 318:3, holding [1] - 320:2

321:1, 327:25,	313:4, 331:20	334:12, 365:20,	interpretation [1] -	304:7
332:14, 333:2,	incorrect [1] - 364:16	365:23, 368:9,	349:12	Keyhoe [1] - 358:7
333:16, 334:15,		368:19, 368:24,		•
334:22, 344:12,	increase [3] - 322:19,		interpreted [2] - 349:10, 362:1	Kilpatrick [3] - 304:18,
348:4, 351:12,	337:8, 364:19	369:3, 370:25, 378:23	*	304:22, 305:4
351:14, 352:2,	indeed [1] - 351:10	individuals ' [6] -	introduced [4] -	kind [2] - 311:8,
352:3, 352:5, 352:6,	independent [1] -		326:17, 375:12,	361:12
352:8, 352:10,	372:24	368:20, 368:21,	375:21, 376:15	KIRSCHMAN [3] -
352:11, 352:12,	Independent [2] -	368:22, 368:25, 369:4, 369:8	involved [1] - 332:24	305:6, 319:9, 379:15
352:17, 352:12,	344:22, 372:10	inference [1] - 357:23	iphones [1] - 337:1	knowledge [1] - 363:5
353:18, 354:3,	Indian [31] - 308:2,	influences [1] -	isolation [1] - 363:22	knows [1] - 340:22
358:3, 364:21,	314:11, 314:12,	324:19	issue [11] - 313:20,	KOHN [1] - 305:7
366:5, 366:8,	318:1, 318:4, 319:6,	information [17] -	320:18, 321:17,	i
366:14, 366:15,	320:4, 320:21, 323:5, 325:5,	309:10, 309:11,	360:25, 361:23,	L
366:24, 367:1	327:19, 332:22,	309:12, 309:18,	369:2, 371:6, 371:16, 371:25,	
imagine [1] - 326:20	344:9, 344:23,	309:21, 314:23,	377:18, 377:25	labeled [2] - 316:17,
immediately [1] -	345:11, 348:12,	316:14, 321:4,	issued [8] - 308:13,	367:1
367:24	349:1, 350:2,	323:1, 326:1,	309:4, 309:15,	lack [1] - 319:9
impact [2] - 337:13,	350:24, 351:4,	326:25, 327:10,	310:2, 310:16,	land [3] - 332:24,
377:23	351:9, 365:14,	373:16, 374:22,	311:4, 360:3, 369:6	333:2, 333:7
impacted [1] - 344:3	365:18, 367:23,	375:13, 375:14,	issues [3] - 332:4,	Land [1] - 333:4
implementation [1] -	370:10, 372:11,	375:17	371:11, 377:4	LAND [1] - 333:4
309:5	372:23, 374:11,	informed [2] - 320:25,	items [1] - 314:22	land-based [1] - 333:2
implicit [2] - 340:13,	378:17	362:9	itself [3] - 325:21,	Land-based [1] -
341:17	Indians [13] - 308:15,	injuries [1] - 369:23	337:12, 361:7	333:4
Implicit [1] - 356:23	319:22, 330:11,	injury [1] - 369:18	007.12, 001.7	lands [3] - 332:20,
importance [1] -	331:5, 339:24,	input [4] - 307:1,	J	332:22, 334:9
366:23	356:11, 356:21,	322:4, 322:6, 322:9	J	large [3] - 312:25,
important [5] -	357:10, 357:17,	inputs [2] - 322:1,		326:15, 332:21
306:22, 360:13,	357:22, 357:25,	322:8	JACQUELINE [3] -	larger [4] - 343:23,
360:17, 366:20,	366:17, 366:24	instances [3] - 321:1,	305:15, 381:2, 381:5	343:25, 353:3,
371:5	indicated [4] - 322:8,	352:22, 354:1	JAMES [1] - 304:11	361:20
improved [2] - 322:8,	341:22, 379:16	instead [1] - 343:21	January [1] - 351:20	last [12] - 318:1,
322:9	indicates [1] - 341:21	instructions [4] -	John [1] - 323:19	324:3, 335:7,
imputed [2] - 343:22,	Individual [3] -	375:3, 375:9, 376:9	JOHN [2] - 305:7,	338:23, 340:2,
346:11	314:12, 344:23,	instrument [1] -	305:10	345:20, 350:14,
include [12] - 310:4,	372:11	361:14	journal [2] - 327:22,	353:4, 353:5, 355:6,
313:6, 316:21,	individual [42] - 308:2,	interchangeably [1] -	352:24	358:15, 359:1
317:19, 331:1,	308:15, 313:8,	329:13	JR [2] - 305:3, 305:6	Law [1] - 304:14
347:6, 349:11,	314:11, 319:6,	interest [17] - 306:20,	Judge [4] - 342:15,	law [2] - 369:20,
349:17, 352:20,	319:22, 323:5,	316:21, 316:25,	342:17, 351:20,	371:12
355:8, 355:17, 366:8	325:4, 331:22,	317:2, 317:6,	352:1	Laycock [4] - 369:19,
Included [1] - 315:9	332:22, 333:12,	317:16, 317:19,	judge [1] - 324:12	371:12, 371:17
included [18] - 310:8,	334:9, 339:24,	317:22, 335:15,	JUDGE [1] - 304:12	Laycok [1] - 330:8
313:5, 323:11,	343:4, 343:5,	339:18, 358:10,	judicial [1] - 349:14	Laykoc [1] - 326:10
334:19, 348:5,	343:14, 344:9,	358:13, 358:15,	June [2] - 304:7, 356:9	leading [1] - 321:9
351:3, 351:9,	345:11, 348:11,	358:25, 359:21,	Justice [3] - 305:8,	leaks [1] - 341:8
352:14, 353:22,	349:1, 350:24,	361:9, 362:23	305:11, 323:20	learn [3] - 325:24,
358:13, 366:17,	351:4, 351:8,	interests [2] - 333:8,	justice [1] - 371:10	330:22, 332:11
366:18, 367:3,	356:11, 356:16,	334:13	JUSTIN [1] - 304:22	learned [1] - 330:9
378:3, 378:4, 378:7,	356:24, 357:10,	Interior [3] - 304:7,		learning [1] - 328:19
378:9, 378:13	357:25, 365:14,	308:21, 372:24	K	least [2] - 315:6,
includes [4] - 335:23,	365:18, 366:17,	intermediate [1] -		315:23
347:1, 349:8, 361:7	366:24, 367:23,	362:1		leave [1] - 355:6
including [2] - 309:18,	369:18, 369:22,	internal [3] - 372:25,	K-1s [1] - 369:2	leaves [1] - 356:18
317:16	370:9, 370:21,	374:8, 374:22	Kathy [1] - 352:7	left [2] - 350:11, 353:9
income [3] - 350:7,	371:9, 371:20, 372:23, 378:17	International [2] -	keep [1] - 340:1	left-hand [2] - 350:11,
351:4, 364:21	372:23, 378:17	325:16, 325:22	Kehoe [1] - 318:17	353:9
incomplete [4] -	individuals [12] - 325:15, 333:17,	interpolation [2] -	KEITH [1] - 304:21	legal [2] - 319:10,
312:18, 313:3,	J2J. 1J, JJJ. 17,	336:6, 336:8	KEMPTHORNE [1] -	330:5

less [2] - 343:25,	lost [1] - 332:3	medical [1] - 324:23	340:13, 341:8,	307:7, 308:16,
360:17	low [1] - 349:19	meet [1] - 361:6	341:17, 344:3,	308:23, 310:21,
letter [3] - 308:14,	lower [1] - 345:5	meetings [1] - 332:13	346:14, 347:7,	311:12, 315:22,
308:18, 308:24	lunch [1] - 306:11	member [1] - 371:20	354:20, 356:13,	318:6, 318:13,
level [5] - 311:22,		members [2] - 333:6,	356:14, 357:11,	318:21, 319:9,
328:7, 332:18,	M	370:7	357:13, 366:11,	319:12, 319:15,
332:19, 355:13		memo [1] - 343:18	366:17, 367:3	320:8, 320:15,
LEVITAS [1] - 304:17		mentioned [2] -	modification [1] -	320:16, 321:9,
lieu [1] - 317:23	machine [1] - 305:21	325:11, 343:5	323:2	321:12, 321:15,
likelihood [2] - 311:5,	majority [1] - 327:14	mentions [1] - 342:19	moment [5] - 310:18,	321:19, 323:15,
,	managed [1] - 372:24	• •	333:1, 347:5,	323:18, 337:21,
311:6	<u> </u>	met [2] - 325:25,	362:14, 365:1	337:22, 339:25,
line [9] - 306:18,	management [1] -	370:25	·	344:15, 344:18,
322:10, 323:14,	329:5	methodology [7] -	money [44] - 311:19,	355:15, 356:1,
324:21, 335:1,	Management [1] -	322:1, 324:5, 324:6,	314:11, 314:12,	
336:16, 345:13,	308:19	324:10, 335:23,	317:22, 318:1,	359:4, 359:7,
357:22, 365:17	manager [5] - 360:5,	375:4, 376:1	318:3, 319:11,	364:24, 365:1,
linear [3] - 336:5,	360:7, 360:8, 360:9	micro [1] - 355:13	327:25, 328:22,	365:4, 365:9,
336:8, 336:13	marginal [1] - 361:18	might [5] - 332:16,	331:4, 339:6,	365:11, 367:9,
linked [1] - 307:1	mariginal [1] - 318:2	335:10, 349:20,	339:16, 339:17,	367:14, 369:9,
listen [1] - 377:7	mark [1] - 318:15	351:1, 351:18	339:19, 339:22,	369:16, 370:3,
listening [1] - 319:3	marked [3] - 318:19,	Miller [8] - 319:3,	340:20, 340:23,	370:6, 370:9,
litany [2] - 375:1,	344:20, 353:2	326:10, 328:9,	341:8, 344:9, 348:4,	370:16, 370:23,
376:8	massive [1] - 361:17	329:3, 340:17,	352:3, 352:6, 352:8,	371:4, 371:14,
literally [1] - 341:16	master's [1] - 335:24	361:4, 377:17	352:10, 352:12,	373:5, 373:8,
Litigation [1] - 305:12		Miller's [3] - 362:17,	352:15, 353:17,	374:25, 375:11,
-	material [4] - 361:16,		355:17, 356:18,	375:20, 376:11,
litigation [1] - 371:5	363:9, 363:16,	377:7, 377:9	357:3, 360:5, 360:7,	376:14, 376:16,
lived [1] - 360:16	374:13	million [34] - 306:18,	360:8, 360:9,	377:11, 377:15,
LLP [3] - 304:18,	materials [4] - 308:7,	310:23, 323:3,	365:24, 367:12,	379:3, 379:5, 379
304:22, 305:4	325:8, 327:15,	323:11, 335:17,	369:14, 370:2,	379:15, 379:20
logic [1] - 364:14	331:17	338:24, 339:16,		multi [3] - 336:19,
logrythmic [1] -	mathematicians [1] -	339:22, 340:4,	370:5, 370:13	
336:14	363:12	340:5, 341:10,	monies [16] - 308:15,	336:24, 337:13
long-lived [1] - 360:16	matter [8] - 322:5,	345:15, 345:23,	318:4, 319:20,	Multi [1] - 336:21
long-run [1] - 332:4	328:4, 328:5,	345:25, 346:1,	319:21, 320:4,	multi-variate [3] -
Long-term [1] -	342:22, 370:23,	346:7, 354:17,	334:11, 334:15,	336:19, 336:24,
361:19	377:19, 379:17,	356:9, 356:10,	340:18, 345:11,	337:13
long-term [2] -	381:4	362:25, 363:1,	351:4, 355:8, 356:4,	Multi-variate [1] -
361:20, 361:25	matters [2] - 373:1,	363:9, 363:19,	356:15, 357:14,	336:21
	374:12	363:23, 364:1,	358:3, 372:23	multiply [2] - 338:7
Look [1] - 321:17	maturing [1] - 361:9	364:3, 364:12,	Monies [2] - 344:23,	340:4
look [14] - 307:9,		364:15, 364:16,	372:11	
338:1, 338:3,	mean [19] - 307:14,		month [2] - 320:6,	N
339:14, 345:6,	309:14, 309:16,	364:19, 364:20	329:22	
345:13, 345:19,	310:10, 314:7,	mind [1] - 345:20	months [3] - 322:6,	
353:2, 354:10,	314:19, 316:18,	minus [1] - 316:19	325:1, 329:16	name [2] - 323:19,
357:21, 359:18,	316:24, 320:6,	minute [2] - 315:3,		343:10
360:14, 363:22,	321:13, 338:21,	379:3	Morgan [1] - 318:17	
372:15	339:18, 343:3,	misplaced [1] -	morning [4] - 328:9,	named [1] - 313:8
looked [10] - 336:9,	344:10, 344:11,	342:21	355:3, 362:16,	national [1] - 317:2
336:10, 341:19,	352:24, 360:25,	missing [2] - 316:13,	379:16	Native [2] - 369:13
349:21, 354:9,	367:18, 375:24	336:7	mortgage [2] - 317:21	370:15
356:8, 371:6, 371:7,	means [9] - 307:19,	mistake [1] - 363:11	most [9] - 311:6,	nature [2] - 326:16
371:16	314:20, 315:5,	model [31] - 313:18,	313:15, 326:5,	328:6
looking [9] - 312:17,	356:22, 364:16,	321:25, 322:9,	332:24, 333:6,	necessary [1] - 329
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	373:13, 373:15,	322:11, 323:4,	346:16, 360:13,	need [10] - 307:20,
330:9, 331:24,			371:4, 372:6	330:25, 335:6,
332:12, 340:2,	374:14, 374:15	323:7, 323:12,	move [4] - 321:18,	346:15, 360:14,
	measure [3] - 324:13,	323:13, 324:5,	375:24, 376:12,	364:3, 364:5, 364
343:4, 346:18,		330:9, 336:13,		
343:4, 346:18, 347:21, 369:16	330:25		376.14	3/7:75
	measures [1] - 334:4	336:14, 336:15,	376:14 MP (65) - 306:4, 306:9	377:25 needed [1] - 332:7
347:21, 369:16			376:14 MR [65] - 306:4, 306:9, 306:23, 307:5,	needed [1] - 332:7 needs [2] - 363:6,

364:19	0	347:3, 358:16	317:21	378:23, 379:2
negotiated [2] -		Ones [1] - 357:16	Outstanding [1] -	Pallais [6] - 343:10,
310:15, 368:1		open [1] - 372:16	318:8	343:11, 343:12,
Net [1] - 341:1	oath [1] - 352:17	opened [2] - 326:5,	oversimplified [1] -	343:17, 379:20,
net [6] - 317:10,	object [2] - 321:12,	375:16	364:10	379:21
317:13, 317:20,	369:9	opening [1] - 375:24	overstate [1] - 357:11	paragraph [7] -
331:6, 362:20, 363:1	Objection [2] - 319:9,	operate [1] - 355:13	overstated [2] - 351:5,	373:20, 373:21,
never [10] - 310:17,	321:9	operating [1] - 328:6	351:11	374:2, 374:7, 374:1
329:7, 334:22,	objection [1] - 321:10	operation [1] - 328:19	overstates [1] -	pardon [1] - 342:2
339:10, 340:14,	observable [1] -	operations [1] - 361:6	352:16	parlance [1] - 320:10
340:24, 341:15,	306:19	opinion [6] - 324:10,	overwhelming [1] -	part [6] - 317:13,
342:13, 360:17,	observation [1] -	326:13, 351:20,	327:14	328:8, 328:18,
366:14	313:2	357:4, 366:21,	owned [1] - 352:10	331:19, 343:18,
new [1] - 340:18	observed [2] - 306:11,	373:17	owners [4] - 347:6,	344:20
next [5] - 304:25,	316:14	opinions [1] - 327:24	347:25, 348:16,	partial [2] - 309:20,
340:8, 374:6, 374:7,	obtain [4] - 326:18,	opportunity [1] -	370:7	312:17
374:17	352:4, 371:10,	339:18	oxymoronically [1] -	particular [11] -
nine [3] - 335:17,	371:16	opposed [3] - 349:2,	352:5	307:17, 317:12,
353:4, 353:5	obtained [8] - 326:19,	350:24, 356:5	302.0	329:23, 338:4,
Ninth [1] - 304:15	,	•	Р	340:16, 354:14,
nominal [3] - 316:17,	326:20, 326:23,	order [2] - 306:2, 317:19	F	356:3, 361:13,
341:6, 362:19	326:24, 326:25,			366:21, 366:25,
none [1] - 312:2	327:2, 327:5, 327:9	originally [1] - 350:20	p.m [4] - 304:7,	375:12
	obviously [3] -	Osage [65] - 313:20,	318:20, 379:12,	particularly [3] -
nonnegotiable [1] - 349:5	335:25, 339:5,	313:21, 313:23,	379:23	306:21, 332:21,
	353:14	314:1, 314:3, 314:8,	P.O [1] - 305:13	343:9
normal [1] - 373:17	occupied [1] - 332:20	314:13, 314:15,	PACER [1] - 349:13	parties [2] - 320:2,
North [1] - 305:5	occurred [1] - 332:3	314:16, 314:20,	= =	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
noted [2] - 316:4,	OF [2] - 304:1, 304:11	314:23, 315:5,	Page [2] - 316:2,	346:15
327:12	Office [2] - 308:20,	315:9, 315:13,	353:5	past [1] - 330:14
Nothing [1] - 379:7	308:21	315:15, 315:18,	page [41] - 304:25,	pause [2] - 365:3,
nothing [2] - 313:24,	Offices [1] - 304:14	315:19, 316:3,	307:8, 307:12,	379:4
379:8	Official [2] - 305:16,	316:5, 316:6, 316:8,	307:22, 309:1,	pay [3] - 317:13,
notice [1] - 335:10	381:2	316:11, 330:23,	309:2, 309:8,	320:20, 363:18
November [2] -	official [1] - 312:6	330:24, 332:5,	309:23, 313:23,	paying [3] - 317:20,
308:22, 309:5	officials [2] - 308:8,	332:6, 332:10,	314:4, 315:1, 317:8,	317:23, 361:8
Number [1] - 309:15	357:18	332:11, 332:16,	318:22, 330:20,	payment [2] - 311:1,
number [29] - 308:13,	oil [3] - 332:21,	332:20, 333:1,	335:7, 338:2,	347:19
308:14, 309:3,	333:11, 333:15	333:10, 333:15,	338:23, 340:1,	payments [9] -
309:14, 315:15,	old [1] - 329:25	333:19, 333:21,	340:2, 345:2,	331:22, 333:17,
315:17, 316:13,	Once [1] - 307:23	334:8, 334:9,	345:20, 346:19,	346:22, 347:1,
318:23, 322:21,	once [1] - 330:11	334:20, 335:2,	351:22, 353:4,	348:16, 349:8,
323:21, 323:22,	One [2] - 321:24,	335:16, 346:21,	353:5, 354:10,	349:10, 349:15,
324:20, 328:6,	375:15	347:1, 347:2, 347:6,	358:17, 359:3,	355:12
328:24, 335:19,	one [27] - 313:1,	348:4, 365:13,	359:8, 372:12,	pays [2] - 349:6,
337:1, 339:4, 342:1,	313:23, 314:22,	365:18, 365:23,	372:14, 372:20,	360:18
342:16, 343:8,	316:2, 320:1,	365:24, 366:3,	373:18, 374:7,	Peachtree [1] - 304:1
345:4, 348:11,	324:17, 336:22,	368:8, 368:15,	374:17, 375:13,	pending [1] - 372:7
349:5, 350:1, 351:9,	337:2, 337:4, 338:7,	368:17, 369:15,	377:6	people [3] - 325:14,
355:8, 360:2,	339:15, 341:16,	369:22, 370:7,	pages [3] - 307:8,	360:19, 363:20
363:12, 375:1	342:18, 343:25,	370:22, 370:24,	345:4, 381:3	PEPION [1] - 304:3
numbers [13] -	347:14, 349:14,	370:25, 376:2, 376:3	paid [21] - 310:13,	per [3] - 328:2,
309:23, 322:3,	354:8, 358:24,	otherwise [2] - 371:9,	310:15, 310:16,	331:10, 370:21
329:19, 330:16,	359:11, 359:12,	372:1	310:19, 311:3,	percent [43] - 306:22
334:1, 343:7,	359:24, 361:1,	ourselves [1] - 373:24	311:14, 311:18,	307:16, 307:19,
345:17, 346:4,	364:13, 365:13,	outline [1] - 342:16	312:9, 339:19,	310:25, 311:1,
363:3, 375:5, 376:1,	371:4, 378:15, 379:3	output [1] - 312:5	341:15, 348:5,	316:6, 316:7,
376:2, 376:5		outside [5] - 342:24,	363:14, 368:1,	322:12, 322:16,
NW [4] - 304:15,	one-hundred-and-	366:5, 366:7,	368:4, 368:13,	322:21, 335:18,
304:23, 305:8,	some-year [1] -	376:18, 376:24	368:24, 378:6,	335:19, 337:15,
305:17	359:24 ones [3] - 336:10,	outstanding [1] -	378:9, 378:16,	337:23, 338:3,

	T	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	T
339:9, 340:5, 340:8,	335:20, 339:4,	proceeding [1] - 365:3	purpose [1] - 376:15	363:21, 376:4, 377:5
340:14, 340:19,	341:3, 361:8	proceedings [2] -	purposes [1] - 361:24	realitively [1] - 352:4
340:23, 341:3,	point [9] - 312:11,	379:4, 381:4	put [6] - 315:18,	really [7] - 307:20,
343:22, 343:24,	314:16, 320:23,	Proceedings [2] -	319:21, 324:20,	317:1, 321:24,
344:1, 344:5,	331:23, 338:24,	305:21, 379:23	330:19, 332:13,	331:20, 333:21,
346:11, 355:2,	339:21, 355:7,	process [3] - 323:24,	358:5	344:11, 360:18
355:7, 355:16,	· · · ·			·
	362:14, 377:22	330:1, 364:11	Putting [1] - 333:1	reason [7] - 309:22,
357:20, 358:18,	pointed [2] - 342:18,	processing [2] -	putting [2] - 320:13,	313:1, 358:15,
358:20, 365:15,	372:14	331:11, 374:10	361:10	361:10, 361:11,
365:22, 366:1,	pointing [1] - 375:15	produced [3] - 305:21,		371:22, 378:19
368:16, 368:17,	points [2] - 337:19,	318:18, 347:19	Q	reasonable [7] -
371:19, 375:6,	358:18	producers [1] - 333:12		312:22, 316:12,
378:1, 378:15	Policy [1] - 318:16	product [1] - 336:3		337:5, 341:13,
percentage [6] -	pollute [1] - 313:1	production [1] -	qualified [5] - 373:14,	346:10, 362:7
310:19, 311:3,	population [1] -	308:18	373:15, 373:23,	receipt [2] - 351:10,
311:4, 316:14,	318:12	products [1] - 337:2	374:4, 375:23	364:15
322:18, 322:22	position [4] - 343:13,	Professor [16] -	quarter [1] - 311:7	receipts [4] - 314:1,
period [7] - 306:21,	346:13, 369:13,	323:19, 324:22,	questionable [1] -	333:25, 351:8,
313:7, 335:15,	370:12	324:24, 326:12,	343:9	366:15
336:16, 342:24,	possibility [2] -	327:3, 330:8,	questioning [1] -	receive [1] - 369:23
359:24, 360:4	322:23, 349:22	344:19, 350:1,	365:17	recently [1] - 325:1
periods [1] - 374:12	possible [1] - 322:20		questions [10] -	recess [1] - 306:11
person [1] - 330:20	•	356:2, 365:4,	318:13, 318:24,	recipients [1] - 331:22
personally [1] - 326:7	potential [1] - 341:11	365:12, 369:10,		•
•	power [1] - 337:8	369:18, 369:19,	323:15, 323:21,	recognize [4] - 308:3,
picking [1] - 361:13	practical [1] - 373:23	371:12, 379:8	335:22, 342:15,	308:4, 308:6, 309:11
pieces [1] - 372:4	practically [1] - 321:2	PROFESSOR [1] -	365:13, 367:11,	recollection [4] -
pilferred [1] - 357:18	pre-1972 [1] - 342:16	380:6	376:17, 379:6	343:3, 350:22,
place [1] - 367:13	precise [2] - 322:3,	professor [2] - 324:22,	quick [1] - 339:15	351:16, 352:7
placed [1] - 344:19	324:13	324:23	quite [4] - 306:22,	reconciliation [1] -
plaintiff [4] - 333:22,	precisely [2] - 325:1,	programmatic [1] -	344:11, 371:6,	347:19
370:5, 370:8, 370:14	345:1	361:8	371:12	reconvene [1] -
PLAINTIFFS [1] -	preconclusion [2] -	project [1] - 325:16	quote [3] - 320:25,	379:18
306:6	371:8, 371:15	projection [1] - 364:3	336:4, 349:5	record [2] - 344:21,
Plaintiffs [5] - 304:5,	prefer [1] - 324:22	proper [3] - 324:5,		381:4
304:14, 308:16,	premised [1] - 367:7	369:25, 370:20	R	records [2] - 309:14,
315:12, 318:15	prepared [3] - 308:7,	prorated [1] - 311:10		332:2
plaintiffs [5] - 308:8,	318:16, 352:25	prove [2] - 322:7,		recover [1] - 369:23
315:19, 318:6,	preparing [2] -	378:24	raised [1] - 323:2	recovery [1] - 371:16
339:10, 341:24		proven [1] - 313:17	Ramirez's [1] - 352:7	Redirect [1] - 380:8
Plaintiffs' [30] - 307:5,	326:13, 330:2	provide [5] - 306:24,	range [1] - 325:9	redirect [2] - 365:8,
307:9, 308:1, 310:7,	present [1] - 316:5	•	rate [17] - 313:6,	
318:19, 326:8,	presented [2] - 326:6,	314:15, 315:23,	317:3, 322:16,	376:7
	378:25	316:3, 373:17	331:16, 335:15,	REDIRECT [1] -
326:21, 326:23,	presumably [2] -	provided [9] - 307:2,	337:15, 337:23,	365:10
327:6, 327:11,	311:20, 339:24	311:24, 312:4,		reduce [2] - 313:5,
327:16, 329:12,	presume [1] - 339:4	314:12, 314:15,	349:19, 357:19,	335:19
329:15, 330:5,	pretty [3] - 330:12,	315:13, 322:13,	358:25, 359:20,	refer [3] - 337:23,
330:19, 330:21,	331:23, 339:4	322:14, 327:16	359:22, 359:24,	348:20, 349:23
338:2, 342:8,	previous [1] - 317:7	provides [2] - 309:3,	359:25, 361:25,	reference [1] - 353:9
342:10, 342:23,	PREVIOUSLY [1] -	341:12	362:23, 371:19	referred [8] - 320:9,
347:22, 349:23,	306:6	providing [1] - 321:20	rates [6] - 306:20,	329:11, 329:12,
250.2 250.12	1	published [2] - 314:9,	358:13, 358:15,	332:5, 334:2,
350:3, 358:12,	primarily [2] - 326:3		361:19, 361:20,	
369:13, 371:18,	primarily [2] - 326:3, 326:15	329:7		350:23, 351:14,
	326:15	329:7	361:21	352:5
369:13, 371:18,	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21,		352:5
369:13, 371:18, 371:22, 372:3	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15 principal [1] - 361:9	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21, 344:13, 349:24,	361:21	352:5 referring [4] - 308:24,
369:13, 371:18, 371:22, 372:3 plaintiffs' [3] - 326:2, 326:4, 343:6	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15 principal [1] - 361:9 private [1] - 344:10	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21, 344:13, 349:24, 351:19, 353:5,	361:21 rather [5] - 312:18,	352:5 referring [4] - 308:24, 327:6, 329:2, 344:12
369:13, 371:18, 371:22, 372:3 plaintiffs' [3] - 326:2, 326:4, 343:6 plug [1] - 316:13	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15 principal [1] - 361:9 private [1] - 344:10 problem [3] - 331:19,	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21, 344:13, 349:24, 351:19, 353:5, 358:23, 362:18	361:21 rather [5] - 312:18, 327:10, 344:4,	352:5 referring [4] - 308:24, 327:6, 329:2, 344:12 refined [1] - 328:7
369:13, 371:18, 371:22, 372:3 plaintiffs' [3] - 326:2, 326:4, 343:6 plug [1] - 316:13 plugged [2] - 307:18,	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15 principal [1] - 361:9 private [1] - 344:10 problem [3] - 331:19, 332:1, 332:4	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21, 344:13, 349:24, 351:19, 353:5, 358:23, 362:18 pulled [2] - 320:17,	361:21 rather [5] - 312:18, 327:10, 344:4, 358:4, 361:13	352:5 referring [4] - 308:24, 327:6, 329:2, 344:12 refined [1] - 328:7 reflect [2] - 314:23,
369:13, 371:18, 371:22, 372:3 plaintiffs' [3] - 326:2, 326:4, 343:6 plug [1] - 316:13 plugged [2] - 307:18, 316:7	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15 principal [1] - 361:9 private [1] - 344:10 problem [3] - 331:19, 332:1, 332:4 procedures [2] -	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21, 344:13, 349:24, 351:19, 353:5, 358:23, 362:18 pulled [2] - 320:17, 345:8	361:21 rather [5] - 312:18, 327:10, 344:4, 358:4, 361:13 ratio [1] - 307:21 read [2] - 352:9,	352:5 referring [4] - 308:24, 327:6, 329:2, 344:12 refined [1] - 328:7 reflect [2] - 314:23, 330:10
369:13, 371:18, 371:22, 372:3 plaintiffs' [3] - 326:2, 326:4, 343:6 plug [1] - 316:13 plugged [2] - 307:18,	326:15 primary [1] - 325:15 principal [1] - 361:9 private [1] - 344:10 problem [3] - 331:19, 332:1, 332:4	329:7 pull [7] - 342:21, 344:13, 349:24, 351:19, 353:5, 358:23, 362:18 pulled [2] - 320:17,	361:21 rather [5] - 312:18, 327:10, 344:4, 358:4, 361:13 ratio [1] - 307:21	352:5 referring [4] - 308:24, 327:6, 329:2, 344:12 refined [1] - 328:7 reflect [2] - 314:23,

351:16, 352:7	327:19, 350:2,	327:18, 342:23,	seated [1] - 306:3	short [3] - 361:21,
refreshes [1] - 352:9	354:8, 373:22	350:1	second [3] - 318:22,	364:24, 364:25
regard [11] - 306:15,	represent [1] - 336:2	right-hand [4] - 345:5,	332:24, 374:18	short-term [1] -
306:23, 310:5,	represented [4] -	350:7, 353:14,	Secretary [1] - 304:7	361:21
316:23, 321:23,	324:5, 354:3,	354:10	section [3] - 320:23,	shorthand [1] -
371:8, 371:19,	354:14, 365:16	rights [7] - 319:10,	351:24, 352:1	305:21
377:11, 378:1,	represents [1] -	332:23, 332:25,	securities [1] - 360:25	shot [1] - 327:7
378:16, 378:25	353:17	357:7, 368:18,	see [34] - 311:2, 311:3,	show [4] - 329:23,
regarding [2] -	requires [1] - 324:16	368:20, 368:21	313:21, 313:22,	333:23, 341:6,
314:10, 324:18	research [1] - 329:8	risk [1] - 360:12	316:20, 318:10,	349:25
regression [6] - 336:2,	researched [1] -	River [2] - 325:20,	331:8, 331:18,	showed [2] - 334:25,
336:3, 336:13,	361:22	325:21	331:20, 335:4,	358:8
336:14, 336:21,	reserves [1] - 332:21	ROBERT [1] - 305:6	335:6, 335:10,	showing [3] - 341:25,
336:24	respect [8] - 306:12,	ROBERTSON [1] -	345:10, 345:11,	342:3, 342:5
regressions [1] -	316:16, 321:23,	304:11	345:15, 347:4,	shown [1] - 327:12
336:4	345:10, 349:14,	Robertson [3] -	347:11, 350:10,	shred [1] - 365:24
related [7] - 319:25,	371:25, 377:13	342:15, 342:17,	350:11, 350:12,	side [4] - 350:7,
329:8, 332:2, 344:8,	response [1] - 371:6	352:2	350:15, 350:22,	350:11, 353:9,
348:11, 350:4,	rest [1] - 309:21	Robertson 's [1] -	351:15, 352:1,	353:14
354:21	restitution [4] - 330:7,	351:20	353:9, 354:10,	similarly [1] - 368:10
reliability [1] - 371:25	369:17, 370:2,	role [1] - 330:2	354:12, 358:17,	simple [1] - 336:5
reliable [3] - 313:16,	370:13	roles [1] - 360:17	359:8, 359:9,	simple [1] - 330:5
313:17, 372:6	restitutionary [1] -	Room [1] - 305:16	359:13, 372:22,	339:2, 344:4, 348:13
Reliance [1] - 374:10	370:4	rough [1] - 354:17	373:1, 374:2	single [1] - 365:24
relies [1] - 321:25	result [1] - 306:17	roughly [3] - 340:4,	seeing [1] - 372:12	•
rely [1] - 375:17	resulted [1] - 374:9	346:1, 363:1	seeking [1] - 370:20	sitting [3] - 328:8,
remain [4] - 306:2,	results [1] - 323:12	rounded [1] - 329:19	Senior [1] - 305:11	344:2, 352:17
311:20, 338:11,			senior [1] - 325:19	situation [1] - 371:18
368:12	retrospect [2] - 346:9,	RPR [1] - 305:15	sense [2] - 328:22,	six [2] - 321:1, 377:6
remainder [2] -	346:12	rule [1] - 349:22	334:24	size [2] - 311:10,
313:12, 314:4	return [1] - 355:19	rules [1] - 357:5	sensitive [1] - 336:17	376:5
remained [1] - 311:19	returned [4] - 319:25,	run [1] - 332:4	sent [2] - 308:8, 326:5	slight [2] - 309:24,
remains [1] - 369:24	354:11, 355:8, 355:17	C	sentence [2] - 309:3,	310:1
remember [5] - 343:4,	revenue [11] - 307:21,	S	373:21	slightly [2] - 329:18,
346:20, 350:5,	314:21, 315:17,		September [2] - 345:9,	358:25
351:17, 365:17	316:10, 342:1,	Salem [1] - 305:5	374:1	small [3] - 341:10,
remembered [1] -	· · · ·	sales [2] - 337:1,	series [2] - 327:2,	359:9, 363:12
remembered [1]				
206:21	342:3, 346:24,			smaller [1] - 363:15
306:21	346:25, 351:5,	337:2	366:3	SMITH [1] - 305:3
removed [1] - 320:17	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] -
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] -	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 34:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6,
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] -	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] -
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:16,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8,
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:16, 352:20, 355:23	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:16, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] -	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20,
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10, 326:12, 327:22,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] - 371:19	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20, 338:18, 345:5,
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 334:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10, 326:12, 327:22, 344:8, 371:17	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4 Schiller [1] - 358:22	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] - 371:19 several [3] - 337:3,	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20, 338:18, 345:5, 346:25, 347:4,
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10 Reporter [3] - 305:15, 305:16, 381:2	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 34:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10, 326:12, 327:22, 344:8, 371:17 reviewed [5] - 327:15,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4 Schiller [1] - 358:22 Schiller 's [1] - 327:3	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] - 371:19 several [3] - 337:3, 343:25, 365:12	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20, 338:18, 345:5, 346:25, 347:4, 347:22, 347:23,
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10 Reporter [3] - 305:15,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 34:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10, 326:12, 327:22, 344:8, 371:17 reviewed [5] - 327:15, 329:2, 331:18,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4 Schiller [1] - 358:22 Schiller's [1] - 327:3 Schwann [1] - 308:18	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] - 371:19 several [3] - 337:3, 343:25, 365:12 Several [1] - 343:24	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soneone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20, 338:18, 345:5, 346:25, 347:4, 347:22, 347:23, 350:9, 360:21
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10 Reporter [3] - 305:15, 305:16, 381:2 reporting [5] - 314:23,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 34:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10, 326:12, 327:22, 344:8, 371:17 reviewed [5] - 327:15, 329:2, 331:18, 341:12, 342:20	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [5] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4 Schiller [1] - 358:22 Schiller's [1] - 327:3 Schwann [1] - 308:18 screen [5] - 307:6,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] - 371:19 several [3] - 337:3, 343:25, 365:12	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soley [1] - 368:18 someone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20, 338:18, 345:5, 346:25, 347:4, 347:22, 347:23, 350:9, 360:21 Sorry [1] - 333:19
removed [1] - 320:17 renamed [1] - 325:21 rephrased [1] - 323:25 replaced [2] - 315:16, 316:9 Report [2] - 344:22, 372:10 report [7] - 321:16, 329:2, 329:5, 345:24, 372:25, 375:20, 375:22 reportable [2] - 374:10, 374:13 reported [4] - 305:21, 314:20, 347:3, 356:10 Reporter [3] - 305:15, 305:16, 381:2 reporting [5] - 314:23, 372:25, 374:8,	346:25, 351:5, 362:20, 364:23 revenues [26] - 310:10, 310:12, 315:10, 316:19, 330:25, 332:10, 332:11, 332:14, 332:16, 332:17, 333:7, 333:11, 333:14, 34:8, 334:19, 335:11, 338:4, 340:4, 340:24, 341:3, 346:23, 348:6, 351:6, 352:20, 355:23 review [5] - 308:10, 326:12, 327:22, 344:8, 371:17 reviewed [5] - 327:15, 329:2, 331:18,	337:2 sample [1] - 313:1 satisfy [1] - 373:24 save [1] - 317:21 saved [2] - 317:2, 317:19 saving [1] - 317:6 saw [6] - 328:24, 328:25, 331:19, 343:20, 358:24, 375:14 scandal [1] - 328:17 scattered [1] - 331:23 schedule [6] - 307:20, 307:22, 309:24, 310:11, 327:4 Schiller [1] - 358:22 Schiller 's [1] - 327:3 Schwann [1] - 308:18 screen [6] - 307:6, 308:4, 345:6, 373:7,	366:3 Service [1] - 308:20 services [6] - 320:2, 320:3, 320:12, 320:14 SESSION [1] - 304:11 seventy [20] - 307:16, 307:19, 314:17, 322:12, 322:15, 322:20, 337:23, 338:3, 341:25, 343:22, 343:24, 344:1, 344:5, 346:11, 365:15, 365:22, 366:1, 371:19, 375:6, 378:1 seventy-percent [1] - 371:19 several [3] - 337:3, 343:25, 365:12 Several [1] - 343:24	SMITH [1] - 305:3 smoothing [1] - 336:15 sole [1] - 342:10 solely [1] - 368:18 soneone [1] - 317:22 Somewhat [1] - 361:22 somewhat [2] - 330:6, 332:1 somewhere [3] - 331:13, 340:8, 342:12 sorry [9] - 337:20, 338:18, 345:5, 346:25, 347:4, 347:22, 347:23, 350:9, 360:21 Sorry [1] - 333:19 sort [2] - 319:13,

sounds [4] - 324:23,	studies [1] - 329:8	techniques [2] -	367:11, 369:11,	transactions [1] -
334:17, 352:17,	subject [2] - 323:2,	336:11, 336:12	370:1, 370:4, 370:7,	374:11
368:14	375:22	template [1] - 330:15	370:12, 370:22,	transcript [2] - 305:21,
source [3] - 326:24,	subsequently [1] -	ten [9] - 306:22,	371:3, 373:7,	381:3
327:12, 359:1	352:20	310:25, 311:1,	374:24, 375:1,	TRANSCRIPT [1] -
sources [3] - 326:2,	substantially [1] -	359:20, 359:23,	375:18, 375:22,	304:11
327:1, 364:22	343:25	361:14, 361:24,	376:12, 377:10,	transcription [1] -
specific [1] - 321:25	substitute [1] - 344:7	362:5, 362:7	379:8, 379:11,	305:22
specifically [6] -	subtracts [1] - 315:7	ten-year [6] - 359:20,	379:13, 379:16,	transfer [2] - 348:22,
310:4, 327:23,	succinct [1] - 315:20	359:23, 361:14,	379:21	353:21
329:10, 332:5,	Suffice [1] - 351:2	361:24, 362:5, 362:7	theft [1] - 331:2	transferred [4] -
350:3, 351:21	sufficiently [1] -	Terence [1] - 318:17	themselves [2] -	352:21, 353:18,
spend [1] - 339:17	373:24	term [8] - 333:2,	331:4, 375:17	367:24, 368:10
spent [3] - 325:7,	suggest [1] - 350:23	336:19, 356:20,	theory [1] - 317:24	transfers [2] - 349:18,
328:18, 339:17	Suite [2] - 304:19,	360:25, 361:19,	therefore [2] - 335:19,	352:23
spoken [1] - 325:23	304:23	361:20, 361:21,	372:6	translates [2] - 323:9,
spreadsheet [2] -	SULLIVAN [3] -	361:25	third [6] - 354:14,	335:14
323:13, 324:20	305:15, 381:2, 381:5	terms [3] - 306:18,	355:20, 355:22,	treasurer [1] - 321:3
staff [5] - 325:12,	sum [2] - 370:2, 370:4	329:13, 348:20	355:23, 357:22,	Treasury [52] - 308:9,
326:3, 326:6, 327:9,	summarizing [1] -	Terry [1] - 358:7	359:8	308:14, 308:19,
332:12	308:7	testified [8] - 323:8,	thirty [13] - 339:9,	311:17, 311:20,
standard [4] - 321:7,	summary [3] - 311:22,	323:22, 326:9,	340:8, 340:14,	312:6, 318:7, 319:7,
336:11, 336:12,	322:13, 373:20	331:22, 347:8,	340:19, 340:23,	319:25, 320:3,
336:13	summary -level [1] -	359:23, 372:3, 377:3	341:2, 341:13, 341:23, 342:3,	320:18, 321:7,
standpoint [1] -	311:22	testify [3] - 312:11,	342:11, 355:2,	327:2, 327:4, 327:5,
319:19	Supp [1] - 351:22	353:19, 378:2 testifying [4] - 319:10,	355:7, 355:16	327:7, 327:10, 328:10, 328:11,
started [3] - 315:15, 330:8, 332:9	support [3] - 322:22,	324:9, 328:9, 343:12	thity [1] - 355:2	328:16, 328:17,
statement [2] -	323:10, 376:9	testimony [12] -	thousand [1] - 310:24	328:20, 328:23,
314:17, 345:8	supported [1] -	318:25, 319:3,	three [6] - 315:3,	329:8, 340:21,
Statements [1] -	311:25	325:11, 328:10,	325:1, 325:15,	347:20, 348:8,
372:11	suppose [1] - 331:3 surprise [1] - 331:24	352:7, 362:17,	343:5, 359:12, 364:7	348:17, 356:5,
statements [2] -	surprised [1] - 331:12	369:19, 372:5,	threshold [1] - 364:5	356:15, 356:17,
373:22, 373:25	suspect [2] - 335:18,	375:25, 377:7,	throughout [1] - 360:3	357:3, 357:4, 358:4,
States [4] - 321:3,	337:12	377:9, 379:9	tip [1] - 364:12	359:20, 360:23,
339:8, 360:20, 361:6	suspicion [1] - 361:1	TGA [2] - 367:8,	today [10] - 323:8,	363:6, 366:16,
states [4] - 309:3,	sustained [2] -	367:12	324:10, 324:12,	366:22, 367:2,
323:4, 352:3, 374:7	369:18, 369:23	THE [66] - 304:1,	326:10, 329:13,	367:16, 367:24,
STATES [2] - 304:1,	Sustained [2] - 321:13	304:11, 306:5,	344:2, 350:2,	368:9, 368:10,
304:12	Swiss [1] - 332:1	306:6, 307:3,	353:19, 369:6,	368:12, 376:18,
Station [1] - 305:13	SWORN [1] - 306:7	310:19, 310:22,	379:14	376:21, 376:24,
statistics [3] - 335:24,	symbol [4] - 309:4,	311:2, 311:5, 311:9,	together [2] - 332:13,	377:12, 377:20
335:25	309:10, 348:8,	311:11, 315:2,	361:11	treat [3] - 332:25,
stay [1] - 367:25	348:17	315:8, 315:11,	tomorrow [3] -	352:12, 354:20
stays [2] - 341:9,	system [7] - 325:5,	315:12, 315:20,	339:24, 379:16,	treated [1] - 332:16
341:14	344:12, 349:13,	317:9, 317:11,	379:18	treating [1] - 318:2
STEMPLEWICZ [1] -	352:5, 352:20,	317:16, 317:18,	took [5] - 309:21,	treats [1] - 356:14
305:10	354:3, 366:21	317:24, 318:2,	310:14, 313:14,	Trial [1] - 305:11
step [1] - 349:25	systemic [3] - 331:18,	318:5, 318:9, 318:11, 319:13,	316:9, 331:4	TRIAL [1] - 304:11
still [5] - 319:5, 349:4,	331:21	320:6, 320:13,	top [4] - 309:2, 315:25, 345:10,	trial [2] - 308:17, 318:18
357:13, 372:13,	systems [1] - 374:22	321:10, 321:13,	353:6	tribal [19] - 314:11,
372:16		321:10, 321:15,	total [11] - 310:4,	315:16, 334:9,
Stockton [3] - 304:18,	T	337:20, 339:16,	311:1, 313:12,	334:11, 350:23,
304:22, 305:4		339:21, 344:17,	332:14, 338:4,	351:12, 351:14,
stole [1] - 337:17	tem (0) 0E7:0 0E7:0	355:6, 355:11,	341:3, 341:11,	352:2, 352:6, 352:8,
Street [5] - 304:15,	tap [2] - 357:2, 357:3	355:20, 355:22,	346:23, 350:6,	352:10, 352:12,
304:19, 304:23,	taxes [3] - 363:14,	355:25, 359:6,	351:8, 356:9	352:15, 352:21,
305:4, 305:8 strike [3] - 346:22,	363:18, 368:24	364:25, 365:2,	totals [2] - 335:6	353:18, 372:22
354:1, 356:13	TAYLOR [1] - 305:3 technique [1] - 316:9	365:7, 367:6,	touched [1] - 339:3	Tribal [2] - 344:22,
007.1, 000.10	technique [1] - 310:9			,

372:10	310:24, 311:8,	UNITED [2] - 304:1,	Virtually [1] - 341:8	379:11
tribe [11] - 314:8,	315:1, 321:23,	304:12	vouchers [1] - 327:22	witness [6] - 321:18,
314:13, 314:20,	321:24, 321:25,	United [4] - 321:3,	vouching [2] - 375:5,	359:5, 359:6, 361:5,
314:24, 315:13,	325:1, 326:2,	339:8, 360:20, 361:6		375:2, 379:19
	333:19, 334:4,		375:6	
332:10, 332:20,		unless [1] - 317:24	\A/	Witness [1] - 379:12
333:24, 370:25,	338:24, 346:11,	unreliable [4] -	W	witnesses [1] - 379:13
371:20, 378:9	347:23, 350:15,	343:12, 343:17,		WITNESSES [1] -
Tribes [1] - 352:3	350:19, 354:10,	372:5, 376:8	W	380:3
true [5] - 343:20,	358:15, 359:12,	unresolved [1] -	Warren [1] - 328:17	word [2] - 346:24,
356:14, 364:12,	360:12, 363:23,	374:11	Warshawsky [13] -	372:7
364:15, 368:3	364:1, 364:3, 364:6	unsuccessful [7] -	321:14, 323:16,	words [4] - 317:25,
trust [46] - 308:2,	two-dollars-and-a-	354:3, 354:11,	323:20, 337:20,	325:24, 330:2,
313:8, 313:9,	half [1] - 311:8	354:21, 355:9,	355:6, 365:12,	352:24
314:11, 314:12,	two-point [1] - 338:24	355:18, 355:19,	366:4, 372:9,	works [1] - 323:24
319:6, 319:17,	type [1] - 312:24	378:6	372:14, 375:12,	worth [3] - 310:23,
323:5, 325:5,	types [1] - 334:19	Unsuccessful [1] -	375:16, 376:17,	311:8, 314:20
327:25, 333:16,	typically [5] - 311:14,	354:22	380:7	written [4] - 367:17,
333:17, 333:25,	328:22, 337:8,	up [32] - 315:2,	WARSHAWSKY [18] -	367:18, 367:19,
334:12, 334:16,	361:20, 361:23	315:25, 322:5,	305:7, 321:9,	367:22
334:22, 341:9,		324:3, 329:13,	321:12, 323:18,	wrongfully [1] -
345:8, 345:11,	U	330:19, 335:14,	337:21, 337:22,	327:25
346:13, 348:12,	<u> </u>	338:17, 338:19,	339:25, 344:15,	wrote [2] - 331:3,
350:23, 350:24,		339:3, 339:11,	344:18, 355:15,	363:15
351:4, 351:9,	U.S [9] - 305:8,	340:20, 341:10,	356:1, 359:4, 359:7,	303.13
351:10, 352:21,	305:11, 305:16,	340:20, 341:10,	364:24, 365:1,	\ <u>'</u>
353:18, 364:21,	308:21, 327:5,	, ,	365:4, 369:9, 379:7	Υ
	360:17, 372:24,	345:3, 345:7, 345:8,	Washington [6] -	
365:14, 365:18,	377:2	345:20, 349:24,		202.42
366:5, 366:8,		351:19, 351:24,	304:6, 304:16,	year [29] - 309:10,
366:16, 366:24,	unallotted [4] -	351:25, 353:5,	304:24, 305:9,	309:20, 312:18,
367:2, 370:10,	350:16, 350:23,	358:5, 358:6,	305:14, 305:17	314:14, 314:21,
372:23, 373:22,	351:3, 351:6	358:18, 358:23,	ways [1] - 336:7	317:1, 317:2, 317:3,
373:25, 374:10,	unambiguous [1] -	361:12, 362:18,	weakness [1] - 374:13	317:6, 317:12,
378:17	312:25	364:6, 372:13	website [5] - 314:9,	338:4, 340:3, 340:9,
Trust [3] - 344:23,	Under [5] - 308:12,	upper [1] - 354:10	327:3, 327:7, 347:3,	340:14, 340:24,
372:10	309:14, 309:16,	utilized [5] - 337:16,	358:22	342:11, 350:11,
trusts [1] - 332:14	313:20, 374:17	348:13, 350:6,	websites [1] - 327:10	351:21, 354:14,
try [6] - 336:25,	under [12] - 309:4,	351:6, 352:3	week [3] - 328:11,	359:20, 359:23,
337:18, 349:24,	309:23, 310:13,		328:21, 363:1	359:24, 361:14,
359:8, 361:11,	316:16, 345:13,	V	weekly [1] - 363:6	361:24, 362:5,
362:17	347:6, 350:14,		weeks [1] - 362:25	362:7, 363:18
trying [11] - 312:18,	352:17, 354:11,		weighted [2] - 361:12,	year's [2] - 316:19,
312:21, 315:4,	357:21, 368:10,	value [1] - 343:22	361:13	359:1
325:24, 325:25,	374:19	variable [3] - 336:25,	wellhead [2] - 332:22,	years [34] - 307:15,
327:3, 332:13,	understandable [1] -	337:3, 337:4	332:25	307:17, 312:19,
351:8, 351:17,	315:21	variables [3] - 337:1,	wells [1] - 332:22	313:12, 315:25,
355:12, 375:8	understood [2] -	337:9, 337:10		
Tuesday [1] - 304:7	330:11, 349:22	variate [4] - 336:19,	West [1] - 305:4	316:5, 317:7, 317:9,
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			whole [2] - 367:7,	317:12, 317:17,
tune [1] - 376:12	undertake [1] - 330:3	336:21, 336:24,	376:8	322:12, 322:14,
turn [11] - 307:8,	undertaken [1] - 362:9	337:13	WILLIAM [1] - 304:18	322:15, 331:11,
307:22, 309:1,	undertakings [1] -	various [1] - 330:21	Winston [1] - 305:5	331:25, 339:3,
309:8, 317:8,	361:8	version [4] - 306:25,	Winston-Salem [1] -	339:4, 340:15,
040 00 070 07	undifferentiated [1] -	329:14, 329:24,	305:5	340:19, 342:17,
318:22, 372:20,	369:14	342:22	wipe [1] - 355:21	342:24, 342:25,
373:18, 374:6,		versions [1] - 329:21	withheld [1] - 327:25	343:4, 343:5,
373:18, 374:6, 374:17, 377:6	undoing [1] - 335:18			
373:18, 374:6,	undoing [1] - 335:18 Unfortunately [1] -	versus [3] - 330:7,	WITNESS [13] - 306:6,	344:24, 345:9,
373:18, 374:6, 374:17, 377:6	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			344:24, 345:9, 346:11, 350:4,
373:18, 374:6, 374:17, 377:6 turned [2] - 309:20,	Unfortunately [1] -	versus [3] - 330:7,	311:2, 311:9, 315:8,	
373:18, 374:6, 374:17, 377:6 turned [2] - 309:20, 312:17	Unfortunately [1] - 363:19	versus [3] - 330:7, 335:2, 377:2	311:2, 311:9, 315:8, 315:12, 317:11,	346:11, 350:4,
373:18, 374:6, 374:17, 377:6 turned [2] - 309:20, 312:17 twenty [3] - 311:7,	Unfortunately [1] - 363:19 unimportant [1] - 363:23	versus [3] - 330:7, 335:2, 377:2 via [1] - 326:3	311:2, 311:9, 315:8, 315:12, 317:11, 317:18, 318:2,	346:11, 350:4, 350:10, 358:3,
373:18, 374:6, 374:17, 377:6 turned [2] - 309:20, 312:17 twenty [3] - 311:7, 335:18, 335:19	Unfortunately [1] - 363:19 unimportant [1] -	versus [3] - 330:7, 335:2, 377:2 via [1] - 326:3 view [5] - 319:5,	311:2, 311:9, 315:8, 315:12, 317:11,	346:11, 350:4, 350:10, 358:3, 359:12, 361:16,

351:24 yesterday [3] - 328:8, 329:3, 375:18 yield [1] - 361:20 yourself [1] - 308:10