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## PROCEEDINGS

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Civil Action 96-1285, Elouise Cobell et al. versus Dirk Kempthorne, et al.

THE COURT: All right. Let's see. Who's going to call the next witness? Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SMITH: Good afternoon.
THE COURT: Good afternoon.
MR. SMITH: Your Honor, our next witness is Mr. Don Pallais.
(Oath administered by Courtroom Deputy.)
MR. SMITH: Your Honor, you had previously heard from Mr. Pallais at the October trial. Just briefly, he is a licensed CPA. If we could have Exhibit 60, please, and the Exhibit 60 is a copy of his CV.

He has approximately 30 years of experience as a CPA, he worked on the audit staff of Coopers \& Lybrand, he was a comptroller in the private industry, he also worked on the staff of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and including serving on the Auditing Standards Board.

Mr. Pallais will testify about, number one, historical problems affecting disbursements from IIM accounts, including money going out without authority, money going to the wrong people, improper transfers of IIM money, theft of IIM funds, and
general category of money being caught up in the system and not being disbursed.

And secondly he will testify about how these problems affect the government's figures regarding disbursements, and particularly those figures in AR-171.

Your Honor, he has previously been tendered as an expert in accounting and accounting principles and procedures. We would tender him for that purpose as well, and I understand the government has no objection to that.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Well, he was considered qualified at the last trial. He still is, unless he's lost a step or two, so he can testify. Go ahead.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.
(DON PALLAIS, PLAINTIFF witness, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Mr. Pallais, would you describe what you have done, the scope of your inquiry in preparation for your testimony today? A. Certainly. You want me to include what I did in October, which set the stage for this?
Q. That would be fine.
A. Well, starting with the October trial, I reviewed the government's historical accounting plan, their accounting
manual, I looked at a number of reports by independent auditors and government auditors that critiqued the IIM accounting and control systems, I reviewed some expert reports for the purpose of determining whether the systems used in the IIM system were generally reliable.

Since the October trial, I read the Judge's findings in the October trial, I've read the filings in this matter, I read transcripts of hearings and some of the trial testimony here. I've also looked at a document called historical compilation of disbursement issues, or something very similar to that, and looked at a database of reports which was very similar to the one I looked at in October.
Q. Back in October, had you been provided with several disks which have been referred to as the meta-analysis documents?
A. Yes.
Q. And generally what did those documents comprise of?
A. The disks comprised a slew of reports. The ones I was interested in were the ones that NORC had characterized as audits, and that constituted about 300 reports.

So I read those 300 reports. There was more in the database but they weren't relevant for my purposes. Q. Okay. The audits that you reviewed, would you characterize those as principally internal or external audits?
A. I think you would characterize most of them as internal audits. There were only a handful done by independent auditors.
Q. And when we're talking about internal audits, what are we talking about?
A. I think what we mean -- I think what you meant when you said it was audits done by government auditors, either the GAO or the Office of the Inspector General, as opposed to a CPA firm. Q. And were these audits of all of Interior's Trust operations or were they more regional or local in scope?
A. There seemed to be a wide range. There were local office audits and there were audits that affected the trust fund overall. There were audits in different parts of the country. There was a fairly wide range.
Q. So it's fair to say that a lot of the documents you reviewed
in preparation for your testimony today you reviewed back in October as well?
A. That's correct. Yes.
Q. And to refresh everyone's recollection, what was the scope of your testimony back in October? What were you asked to talk about?
A. What I was asked to talk about was whether the government's historical accounting plan could be depended on to achieve the objectives of the plan, which would be a complete and accurate accounting of the transaction histories for the individual Indian accounts. And my conclusion was that based on decades of experience and reports of auditors, it appeared that the system was too unreliable to be used as a basis that way.

The plan intended to largely use internal documents, and the history of the IIM Trust was that internal documents were notoriously unreliable.
Q. Okay. Now, what have you been asked to look at today?
A. What $I$ was asked to do for this trial was a similar exercise, except I was specifically asked to look at controls and observations regarding disbursements over the decades.
Q. Okay. And based on your examination of those audits, what conclusions have you reached?
A. My conclusions are that you cannot depend on disbursement numbers to represent valid disbursements to individual Indians.

So to the extent that the disbursements are intended to portray disbursements to IIM account holders, the system is not good enough, not dependable enough that you can be sure that those disbursements represent valid payments to the appropriate recipients.
Q. Okay. Have you had an opportunity to look at AR-171, which was part of the administrative record from the October trial? A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: If we could have a copy of that, please. BY MR. SMITH:
Q. On the screen is a document. Is that what you understand to be AR-171?
A. Yes.
Q. And looking at that document, there's an evident disparity
between collections and disbursements. Is that correct?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. And what is that approximate disparity?
A. As near as $I$ can recall, it was about three and a half billion dollars. Collections were three and a half billion dollars more than disbursements.
Q. If you look at Column $G$, is that the disbursement column?
A. Yes.
Q. And is there any information prior to 1972 on disbursements?
A. There's none listed, no.
Q. Okay. Have you had an opportunity to compare that to a revised AR-171 provided by the government?
A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: If we could see that document, please. The first one, yeah.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Is this a copy of the document you've reviewed?
A. This is one of the them. This appears to be the May 30 th version.
Q. So you've seen two different revised AR-171s?
A. Yes.
Q. And when did you first see the Revision 1?
A. Must have been about a week ago.
Q. And Revision 2?
A. I want to say over the weekend maybe.
Q. And in revised $A R-171$, disbursements is now reflected in Column H. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And does it appear at this point that within the past week or two, pre-1972 disbursements have been filled in with some numbers?
A. On this version there are now pre-1972 disbursements.
Q. Okay. If you could -- on Column $H$ there's a reference to footnote five, and I believe that's on the second page. If we could look at that, please. If we could focus in on five.

And what does footnote five indicate Column $H$ represents?
A. Column $H$ represents all outflows from the IIM system.
Q. Okay. And includes, it says Tribal Trust checks and electronic funds transfers?
A. Correct.
Q. In your review of documents, did you encounter any documents related to electronic fund transfers?
A. I don't recall any.
Q. Did you as far as checks and Tribal Trust transfers?
A. Yes, there were lots of documents that referred to checks and transfers.
Q. And if we could look on the next page. And focus in on item H. And does it appear that the data from 1887 through 1971 came from something called a NORC disbursement estimate?
A. Yes, that's what it says.
Q. And at this point, have you been provided any data regarding that estimate?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Mr. Pallais, based on the review that you have performed of the audit data over the past 100 years of this Trust, what if any opinions have you developed regarding the ability to determine the propriety of disbursements from the IIM Trust?
A. Well, as I mentioned, to the extent that disbursements are supposed to represent valid payments to IIM beneficiaries, the controls and accounting procedures that the IIM used over the decades was sufficiently unreliable that you can't depend on that number being a valid representation of the amounts that actually went to the correct IIM beneficiaries.
Q. And what's the basis for that?
A. Looking at 100 to 150 reports over almost 100 years of history.
Q. And what are the types of problems that you encountered that led you to that conclusion?
A. There are a number of problems. There are lack of authorization for payments, there are recorded instances of payments not going to the right people, there have been instances of fraud, there are a lot of internal control weaknesses, lack of segregation of duties, lack of control over
the checking account or the checks, there are lack of reconciliations, there are a number of problems that occurred with some frequency for years and years and years.
Q. That was my next question. Would you characterize these problems as sporadic or of a more pervasive nature?
A. They appear to be fairly pervasive. You see the same observations, comments, and criticisms decade after decade.

MR. SMITH: If we could see Exhibit 65, please. BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you describe for the Court what Exhibit 65 is?
A. This is a document that summarizes observations made in roughly 100 to 150 reports, starting from 1905 and goes all the way through 2006 or so. These represent quotes or descriptions of criticisms of internal control regarding disbursements taken from reports that presumably were in the NORC database.
Q. Okay. And you have a listing of a year and then a quote or a summary under there. And then can you actually link to the document itself that has that summary?

THE COURT: I think you neglected to ask the witness who prepared this.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Can you describe for me who prepared this document?
A. I'm not sure who prepared it.
Q. Okay.

THE COURT: Oh.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Have you reviewed this document?

THE COURT: I thought he was going to say that he prepared it. So it's just a document?

MR. SMITH: It is a document, Your Honor.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Have you reviewed this document?
A. I have reviewed the document. I've looked at all of the reports that are referenced, and from what $I$ can tell, the quotes and descriptions are a fair representation of what is actually in the report.
Q. And are the quotes consistent with the documents that you've reviewed back in October?
A. Yes.
Q. And do they fairly reflect your opinions regarding the disbursement issues since 1905 through 2006?
A. They fairly reflect the opinions of the people who wrote the reports, I presume.
Q. Okay. They fairly reflect the problems that were encountered over the 100 years of the Trust?
A. Yeah, this document fairly reflects what the reports written by auditors say.
Q. And you indicated the source for the majority of the documents are meta-analysis documents from NORC?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, in some years there's nothing listed. Is that fair?
A. That's true.
Q. Were there some years where you had no audit reports at all?
A. There were no audit reports in the NORC meta-analysis. That's correct.
Q. When performing an audit, what if any importance do you place on identifying internal controls?
A. Internal controls is typically an important feature of an audit. Now, there are two kinds of audits we need to keep in mind here, because there are two kinds of audits being done on the IIM Trusts.

There are independent audits, what we call GAAS audits, Generally Accepted Auditing Standards, and these are done by independent auditors, CPA firms. And the purpose of the GAAS audit is to render an opinion on whether the financial statements fairly present financial position or results of operations in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

When we do an independent audit, the auditor is required to understand internal control as part of doing that audit. The auditor has to understand enough about internal control, that is the accounting processing and the disciplines over the accounting system, to understand what kinds of things could go wrong, what kinds of things could be misstated in the
financial statements.

He also has to understand internal controls in sufficient detail to figure out where are the areas of increased risk, where are errors or misstatements more likely to occur, because what the auditor wants to do is focus on the areas where the misstatements are more likely to occur.

The auditor also has to understand internal control enough so that he can design the actual tests he's going to apply. You can't test documents unless you know what they represent and where they came from.

If controls are effective, if they're really good, the auditor can test their effectiveness and rely on the company's controls to reduce the amount of testing he does. On the other hand, if the controls are not that effective, the auditor can't rely on them, the auditor can still complete the audit, though. Generally we can audit around problems in the internal controls by merely doing more or better kinds of tests.

In really egregious cases the controls are so bad that the auditor actually can't do an audit and can't render an opinion.
Q. Now -- I'm sorry, go ahead.
A. The other kind of audit is an internal audit, or what we might call an operational or performance audit. Now, the amount of work you do on internal controls on one of those is entirely dependent on what your goal is in the audit. Often it's the
case that the whole point of the audit is to look at some aspect of control. You might not be looking at the entire control structure, but you want to see some aspect of control and see if it's working efficiently and effectively. And in that case internal control is obviously of paramount importance, because that's what you're doing.

You might also do an internal audit that has absolutely nothing to do with controls, and in that case you wouldn't look at internal control at all and you very well probably would not have any observations regarding internal control, because that's not what the auditor was intending to look at.
Q. And when auditing something like the IIM Trust, what kinds of internal controls would you expect to exist?
A. If you're looking at the IIM Trust, the kinds of controls you would expect to exist if this were well functioning are ones that ensure that -- and we're talking about now disbursements, I presume, controls over disbursements?
Q. That's correct.
A. We would expect to see controls that make sure the disbursements are only paid to the right people in the right amounts, and that the system captures all of the disbursements made.

So you would expect to see a lot of controls. And although this isn't a comprehensive list, the kinds of controls you would expect to see would be things like disbursements are
only made if they're authorized, so disbursements should only be made if the beneficiary has specifically requested the disbursement be made to him. And you would expect to see some documentation of that.

You would also expect to see that somebody at the Trust ensured that the payments were only being made based on the right documentation, a signed request by the beneficiary, and so you would expect that that person would authorize the actual payment.

You would expect controls to make sure that the records are internally consistent and have integrity. So, for example, you would want to make sure that the controlled account that shows the amount owed to all of the beneficiaries agrees to the total of the detail, the total of the individual accounts. So this way you know that if a disbursement has been made, it has been allocated to a particular account. You don't have disbursements made that haven't been allocated to anybody.

You would expect to see that the cash account in the general ledger agrees to the cash reflected at the bank, or in this case the Treasury Department, to make sure that all of the disbursements that you have made have actually been recorded.

And you would expect a third kind of discipline over this, which is to say you would expect statements to be sent to the account holders so that if there's a problem in the individual account, they would complain and bring it to your
attention.

So you would know, as a result of those three, that all disbursements have been recorded in individual accounts, you've accounted for all disbursements, and the allocation to the individual accounts are correct because the individual Indians would have complained if they were charged for a withdrawal they didn't make.

You would also expect to see segregation of duties. What this means is you would have internal checks, one employee checking the work of another. If you have one person doing everything, for example, it would be very hard to catch a mistake, whether it be unintentional or intentional. So you don't want one person writing the checks and accounting for the checks and doing all those other things.

You would also expect to see controls over the writing of checks, that only certain people are allowed to sign checks, certain people are allowed to approve them, that there's controls to make sure other people can't write unauthorized checks.

And you would expect to see something where there's monitoring of accounts where mistakes could happen. For example, when there are negative balance accounts, you would want somebody looking at negative balance accounts to say, how did that get overdrawn, what's the mistake and how do we fix it. Or if there are dormant accounts, for example, dormant accounts
are a great place to look if you wanted to misappropriate funds, because there isn't a beneficiary who is on top of it, since it's dormant. So you would want regular reviews of dormant accounts to see if there's any unexpected activity.

So those are the kinds of controls you would expect to
see. Obviously there are a lot more specific controls, but that's just kind of a summary.
Q. When you're talking about statements, are you talking about statements that would be clear and understandable to a beneficiary?
A. Yeah, I would presume they would not be useful if they weren't clear and understandable.
Q. The types of internal controls that you've identified, were those present based on the audits you reviewed in the IIM Trust? A. There were deficiencies probably in every one of those areas that were referred to in reports over the decades covered in the NORC database.

MR. SMITH: If we could look at Exhibit 61.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And is this a summary of some of the major disbursement problems that you identified?
A. Yes.
Q. Lack of authorization or support for disbursements, absence of reconciliations, lack of segregation of duties, absence of statements, absence of thumbprints or other identifications,
problems with supervisory accounts, dormant accounts, negative balance accounts, lack of addresses, failure to safeguard checks, general findings of lack of controls, and then last one, improper distributions and theft. Is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I want to briefly go through some of those items and show you a few examples.

Let's focus on the first one, lack of authorization or support for disbursements. What are you talking about?
A. Well, as I mentioned, controls you would expect to see include the fact that disbursements are only made when requested by the account holder, so you don't want money being spent out of somebody's account if they didn't ask for it to be done, or if somebody who is unauthorized to ask for it asks for it to be done.

You also want controls at the Trust itself to make sure that funds are only being expended based on those requests.

MR. SMITH: If we could look back to Exhibit 65, please, and go to item 41, 1954.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And if we could hyperlink on that and if you could tell us what this document is.
A. This appears to be a report on an audit at Anadarko done by the Department of Interior in 1954.
Q. And is this one of the documents you reviewed in preparation
for your testimony today?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we could go back to the actual hyperlink page. If you could focus in on the first paragraph under 13.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Can you describe for the Court what the problem is with respect to authorization for disbursements?
A. Well, it shows that nearly three quarters of the disbursements were not supported by the proper authorization, and of the ones that were supported, half didn't have the document the Department of Interior required.

Where they were on file, almost one out of five were not filled in completely, and more than a quarter were approved by somebody who also prepares and issues the checks. So somebody was preparing, approving, and doing the check, which is a segregation of duties problem.
Q. This example, is it an isolated example?
A. No. There were examples of unauthorized payments throughout the database through most of the decades.
Q. Okay. Would the problems with the lack of authorization include authorizations signed by someone other than the beneficiary?
A. Yeah, there would be requests by people other than the beneficiary.
Q. What about transfers of funds? What kinds of problems did
you identify with respect to transfers of funds?
A. Well, some of the problems that were identified include transfers to government agencies without what the auditor considered to be appropriate support.
Q. How about transfers to third parties or Indian tribes?
A. Right. Well, I guess when I said government agencies, what

I intended to include was Indian tribes, other people. And there would also be checks made out to third parties who did not appear to be authorized recipients.
Q. And again, were these problems isolated or fairly common?
A. They occurred across the database.
Q. You were looking at the government's disbursement numbers. Why is this important?
A. Well, to the extent that we are assuming that the disbursements represent valid disbursements to individual Indians, this calls that assumption into question because we're being told that there are checks being written that people didn't ask for.
Q. Now, just because a distribution may not be authorized, or there may not be any documentation of the authority doesn't mean it was not actually received by the correct beneficiary. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. What if anything did you see in your examination of records that supported your concerns that money was in fact not being
received by beneficiaries?
A. Well, there were a number of situations where the auditor contacted beneficiaries directly, and the beneficiaries reported that the amounts shown as disbursed to them were not received by them.
Q. What is a confirmation or a negative confirmation in accounting terms?
A. Well, confirmation is a type of audit test we do. It's one of the strongest kinds of tests we have. In a confirmation, we typically go outside of the audited entity to ask some independent third party to provide evidence about amounts recorded in the financial statements.

Typically we see this in accounts receivable in a typical commercial entity. The commercial entity will say, this customer owes us $\$ 10,000$, and the auditor will send a letter directly to the customer saying, do you owe the client $\$ 10,000$, please tell us. And the response will come directly back to the auditor. This is very strong audit evidence.

Confirmations in general fall into two kinds. We have what we call positive confirmations, in which case we send out the request and we ask the person on the other end, please tell us specifically, do you agree with this number; if yes, tell us yes, if no, tell us why you disagree. If it's a positive confirmation, we expect a response back in either case.

Negative confirmation, we send out a letter that says,
please contact us if you disagree. You don't need to do anything if you agree, but if you disagree, please tell us. Q. In a typical situation where you would send out a confirmation or a negative confirmation, based on your experience, what would be the response?
A. Positive confirmations vary all over the lot, depending on the client base, the industry, and that sort of thing. Negative confirmations, there's no predictability at all, and in fact, when I was on the Auditing Standards Board, we issued Statement on Auditing Standards Number 67, which essentially says you can't use negative confirmations for audit evidence. It doesn't say absolutely, but it says most of the time you can't, except in some very specific situations.

And the reason for that is, it doesn't provide you a basis to draw a lot of conclusions. If you don't get any responses back on negative confirmations, you don't know whether everybody agrees. People might not agree but they didn't bother to read the confirmation, they just threw it away. The confirmation was sent to the wrong address and the intended recipient never got it. So the fact that you don't get a response back doesn't give you much in the way of audit evidence.

On the other hand, when you do get them back, it tells you that you might have a problem.
Q. The auditing standard you mentioned, was that subsequent to
$1990 ?$
A. That was issued around 1990 or 1991. I think it was 1990, sometime in that range.
Q. Okay, good. In the examples that you saw in the audits that you reviewed, were they significant or no?
A. The responses were significant. A very large contingent of people wrote back to the auditors saying that the statements they received were not correct, and a large number said that they did not receive the disbursements reflected in the statements.
Q. We'll see an example of one. If we could look at 1986, number 261. And if we could go to the first page of that document.

And can you tell us what document this is?
A. This is an audit report by the Department of Interior's Office of Inspector General. So this was not done by an independent CPA firm, this was done by government auditors.
Q. And does it look like it's March 1986 ?
A. It looks like 1986.

MR. SMITH: If we could go back to the original page. BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you describe what is happening here?
A. Yes, although if you could scroll up just a little bit, that would be good. Stop.

What they did was they selected 1410 disbursements
posted on ledger cards and they sent confirmations to the account holders. And these went out, and what they got back was, of the 1410,103 responded that they had not received the IIM checks reflected on the statements, and that totaled $\$ 328,000$.
Q. And it looked like they had about 850 of them returned?
A. There were 850 returned for one reason or another, yes.
Q. What if any significance is that in terms of an auditor?
A. Well, the 103, you have 103 in disagreement based on a sample of 1410. I haven't done the math, but that's got to be an 8 percent problem rate. That's a very high rate. That's an unusually high rate of problems.
Q. And 15 to 16 percent of those that actually returned the confirmation?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. There were subsequent negative confirmations by Arthur

Andersen. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the Court has already heard testimony about those, so I won't belabor those, but can you just generally describe your reaction to the negative confirmations delivered by Arthur -- or received by Arthur Andersen?
A. Well, Andersen did negative confirmations not as an evidence gathering tool but to look at this issue. And their results were very similar to the OIG results. They got a lot of people
writing back, unusually high number of people writing back to say, we never got these disbursements, we never got these checks.
Q. In fact, in the case of Arthur Andersen, it would be close to over 30 percent?

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Objection, Your Honor, leading the witness.

THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SMITH: If we could look at 1988, number 267.
THE COURT: Before you do 1988, number 267, go back to that 261 , that part that you showed. There's something just underneath the quoted part that said we're going to compare the missing checks to the responses we got. Let me read the rest of that paragraph and then tell me if you know, if either Mr. Pallais, or for that matter Mr. Smith knows, whether that was ever done and whether we have any evidence of the result.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I can tell you in the documents that we've received, we have not seen any response -- seen that that was ever done.

THE COURT: Any follow-up on that.
MR. SMITH: That's correct.
THE COURT: Do you know of any, Mr. Pallais?
THE WITNESS: No, sir.
MR. SMITH: Thank you.
If we could look at 1988, number 267.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And does that refresh your recollection as to the response received by Arthur Andersen?
A. Well, it says they got 1249 responses, and of the 12 -well, it doesn't say what the sample size was, it tells you that 30 percent of the responses talked about not receiving the payments. So that would be roughly 400 people said they didn't get payments.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Objection, Your Honor. The documents in the pleading attached to the May 30 th response to our motion in limine speak for themselves. While we may not object to Mr. Pallais analyzing the results as an accountant, we do object to him actually just reading from the screen.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm going to overrule that because he's reading at the same time I'm reading, so I don't attach any particular significance to the fact that he's reading it.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Does the Arthur Andersen result confirm your concerns regarding failure to receive funds by beneficiaries?
A. Yes, it's clearly a concern. Andersen found it, the Department of Interior found it, so it's clearly a concern. Q. The second item on your list was absence of reconciliations, and the Court has already heard a lot about reconciliations so I don't want to again belabor that point. But when you're talking
about absence of reconciliations, what are you talking about? A. There are two things that need to be reconciled here. One is that the total of all of the individual Indian accounts should agree with or at least reconcile to the general ledger control total, so you know that everything has been accounted for.

The other reconciliation that you need to be concerned with is the cash shown by the IIM Trust agrees with essentially what his bank says, in this case the Treasury Department, so you know that all of the cash transactions have been appropriately accounted for. Or I think appropriately included.
Q. Let's talk about the first one, subsidiary to the general ledger. Why is that important when you're talking about accuracy of disbursement data?
A. Well, if we are saying that disbursements were made to individual Indian beneficiaries, then each of those disbursements should be reflected in the IIM account. And if the total of the IIM account doesn't agree with the control total, you've got an issue, you've got either something that was paid and not recorded or something that was recorded but not paid, or something that was paid to somebody other than the IIM beneficiary.

And unless you can reconcile those two numbers, you're not sure what the right number to use for disbursements is. Q. Okay. If you don't reconcile the subsidiary and general
ledger promptly, what happens?
A. Well, if you're extraordinarily lucky, if you have a problem, it fixes itself the next month, if you're extraordinarily lucky.

If the problem with reconciliation is a systemic problem, then over time it just gets worse. More and more errors get made, and the difference between the total of the individuals and the control total can get bigger or it can get smaller, but if it gets smaller, that doesn't mean necessarily the situation is getting better, it just means you -- it might just mean you've got new errors going in a different direction than the original errors were.

But generally, over time, if it's a systemic error, it just gets harder and harder to reconcile.
Q. In what you've reviewed, is it an isolated problem or a systemic error?
A. It appears to be a systemic error because it occurs over decades.
Q. This Court has already seen disparities between the subsidiary and general ledger in, let's call it the modern era, subsequent to 1980. Were there problems like that back in earlier years?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And when the problems were identified, were they corrected?
A. Typically there's no indication that they've been corrected.

I recall one instance where somebody forced an adjustment on the control account to get it to agree to the total of the individual accounts, but that doesn't necessarily mean they corrected the error, that just meant they forced the two to agree.
Q. What do you mean, they forced the two to agree? What did they do?
A. Well, they looked at the difference between the control account and the total of the individual accounts, and they just adjusted the control account so that it agreed. They changed the number so it agreed with the total of the individual accounts.
Q. So there was no indication whether the agreement was proper or not?
A. That's correct. It presumed that the individuals were right and the control account was wrong. But from my reading of the report, they really had no evidence that that was the case. Q. Let's talk generally about Treasury. You've mentioned that and the Court has seen imbalances between Treasury and the general ledger. How does that affect your concern about disbursements?
A. Well, again, if you can't reconcile your bank account, if at the end of the month $I$ can't reconcile my personal bank account to what the bank shows, I don't have any confidence that my checkbook is right.

And if I'm reporting to people based on the results in my checkbook, they've got no reason to believe that my disbursements are right.
Q. Okay. The next item on your list was lack of segregation of duties. And what is the importance of that?
A. Well, segregation of duties is a basic control concept. One aspect, the most obvious is you want people checking each other's work. But you also don't want somebody to have what's called incompatible duties, so you don't want, for example, the same person to approve the checks, write the checks, and do the accounting for the checks. Because if the person makes a mistake, nobody will ever notice it because they're the ones that do the follow-up.

If they want to misappropriate funds, that's the position to do it in because you approve it, pay it to yourself, and then bury it in the accounting records.

So in a good control structure, you want segregation of duties to separate those functions, so if somebody does something wrong, somebody else can catch it.

MR. SMITH: Let's look at 1953, number 35. If we can go to the document itself, the first page.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you describe for the Court what this document is?
A. This is a report done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, June 1953. It's apparently a GAO document.
Q. And is this one of the documents that you reviewed in preparation for your testimony today?
A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: And if we could go to the actual hyperlink page. And if we could focus on the first full paragraph, under "inadequate internal control."

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. If you could read that, and it goes on to the next page?
A. In this case what it's saying is one person receives cash, prepares official receipts and schedules of collections. So they're receiving the cash, accounting for the cash. Enters the receipts in a cash receipt book, makes the deposit -- I can't make out the first word. Totals the cash receipts book, makes postings to the individual accounts.

So they're accounting for the cash coming in, taking it to the bank, and making the entries into the individual ledger cards for the individual Indian accounts; sends the statements, prepares the disbursements, and if statements come back, this person gets them.

So this one person takes care of all the receipts, does the disbursements, does the accounting for them, and is in charge of correspondence with the individual Indian beneficiaries. So if this person wanted to misappropriate funds, nobody would ever find it, unless they were particularly poor at what they did.
Q. And in this particular example, again, is it an isolated occurrence or is it fairly routine?
A. There are comments criticizing the lack of segregation of duties across the decades.
Q. And again, how does that impact your evaluation of the disbursements by the government?
A. Well, that tells you that if this situation exists, there is a substantial risk that the disbursements being reflected in individual Indian accounts actually didn't go to those people, they might have gone to the person who wrote the checks.
Q. The next item you mentioned was absence of statements, and you talked a little bit about the importance of statements. Let me show you an example.

MR. SMITH: If we could turn to 1954, number 48. If we could link on the document and show the first page.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you describe what this document is?
A. This appears to be a 1955 audit done by the GAO.
Q. And is this again one of the documents you reviewed in preparation for today?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we could go back to the link page and focus in on the first full paragraph.
A. What this is saying is that statements -- that procedures called for statements to be sent semiannually, but the Fort Peck

Agency was not doing that. People only got statements if they specifically asked for them. And the reason they didn't, according to this, is that when they did send statements out, so many people disagreed with them that they came in and filled the office.
Q. And again, we just looked at one example, but how common was this problem?
A. There are comments across the database indicating that statements weren't being sent.
Q. Next item, you had thumbprints or other identification. Can you describe for us what those concerns were?
A. Well, this is something that primarily affected earlier years, and apparently was not unusual for Indian beneficiaries not to be able to write. So to transact business, they provided a thumbprint rather than a signature, and to make sure that the appropriate person was receiving the cash, the policy was that people were supposed to witness the thumbprint to attest to the fact that this is the right person.

And there are comments in many years, many audits indicating that this witnessing was not going on.
Q. Next item, you have three entries, supervisory accounts, dormant accounts, and negative balance accounts. What are supervisory accounts?
A. Supervisory accounts are those accounts where the person who owns the account is not judged capable of taking care of their
own business. It might be a minor or it might be an incompetent. So somebody has control over the account for them. Q. And what kinds of problems did you see with supervisory accounts?
A. For supervisory accounts, for minors, for example, you might see -- or they did see disbursements going out for things that were not apparently for the benefit of the minor, things like pawn tickets, purchases of vehicles. There were other problems with minor accounts in that once the minor had aged out, they did not inform them that the money was available to them.

Typically -- or not typically, but often the supervisor was somebody who worked for the Trust, so an employee actually had full authority over the beneficiary's account.

MR. SMITH: If we could look at 1986, number 259, and go to the first page of that document.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you identify for us what this document is?
A. This is an OIG audit report dated March 1986.

MR. SMITH: And if you could go back to the link page and link on it.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And if you could review that and tell generally what the problem is that the auditor identified.
A. Well, this is use of minors' funds for things that the auditor apparently did not think was clearly justified.

Parents' debts were being paid, pawn tickets, hospital bills. Q. For the parents?
A. For the parents, yes. Purchase of furniture and appliances, \$10,000 from a nine-year-old was used for the down payment on a van.

THE COURT: Mr. Smith, is this particular example an example of a disbursement problem that falls under the restitution category or is this more of a management problem that might fall under damages?

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I think this would fall under restitution.

THE COURT: The money was paid. Right?
MR. SMITH: We don't know if it was paid or not. It went out but we don't really know where it went, whether it went for the benefit of the supervisor or someone else.

THE COURT: Well, purchase furniture and appliances, parents have a down payment for a van. All right. Go on, go on. I'm not sure what portion of this this bears to the whole, but it strikes me as a slightly off-kilter example of what you're talking about.

MR. SMITH: I understand, Your Honor.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Let's go on and talk about dormant accounts. What is the concern with dormant accounts?
A. A dormant account, by definition, has very little activity,
so there is a question about whether anybody is monitoring the account. If the account is dormant, and there is no beneficiary who is aware that the money is owed, if I were going to misappropriate funds, that would be a place I would do it because the odds on somebody finding it are not really that good.
Q. And how many instances did you see of problems with dormant accounts?
A. There were several instances where there were criticisms of the review and accounting for dormant accounts.
Q. And if we could look at 1982, number 222. And if you could
link on the first page and tell us what this is?
A. This is a report to Congress by the Comptroller General describing improvements needed in the BIA accounting system. Q. And go back to the link page, and third full paragraph, if you could focus on that.
A. And in this case, what they're saying is, as I mentioned, dormant accounts need to be reviewed to see if there's any unusual activity, and the Comptroller General report says that they're not being periodically reviewed, making fraudulent use of the funds easier. And they point to at least one example where a Tribal employee was convicted of embezzling more than \$26,000 from a dormant account that belonged to an aged, incompetent adult.
Q. The next item was actually negative balances. What are we
talking about when we talk about negative balances?
A. Well, negative balances, they have paid out more than the account holder had in their account. That's obviously an issue, because presumably this person now owes the Trust some money. Whether it was ever paid is a question. As an auditor, you have to satisfy yourself that that debt was ultimately collectible, and I'm not sure that the auditors ever did that.

But if money is being paid inappropriately to somebody that is included in the disbursements, clearly that disbursement was not a valid one.
Q. How often did you see problems with negative balances?
A. There were several references to negative balances going back to the 1950s.
Q. And are we talking about small amounts of money or somewhat larger?
A. It varied. There were very small amounts and very large amounts.
Q. In millions?
A. Yes.
Q. And again, how does that affect your concerns about disbursements from the Trust?
A. Well, it tells you that the fact that a disbursement has been made doesn't mean it went to a valid recipient.
Q. How would negative balances affect those concerns where you're dealing with an account that might be commingled?
A. Well, to the extent that your total was correct, a negative -- if you've overpaid one person, you will by necessity have to have underpaid another person.
Q. Next item on your list was lack of addresses. And just describe generally for the Court what the concern was.
A. Well, the concern of the auditors was for large portions of some of the populations, the Trust did not have current addresses for the beneficiaries. So if a check was mailed to the beneficiary, the question arises, where did you mail it if you don't have a current address? If you sent a statement, where did you send the statement if you don't have a current address?
Q. And how common was this concern reflected by the auditors?
A. There were several reports that discussed this issue.
Q. And are we talking about just a handful of addresses or something more significant?
A. In some cases it was very significant.
Q. If we could look at 1956, number 105. And can you describe what this document is?
A. It's a 1956 audit report in the Aberdeen area, done by a government auditor, but I'm not sure which department it is from looking at this.
Q. And if you could link on to the -- under analysis, if you could focus in on that paragraph under there in the middle of the page.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. What was the problem with addresses there?
A. It said that of 581 accounts, 87 percent did not show the addresses of the account holders. Also had problems with dates of birth.
Q. Again, problems that were not isolated but were fairly routine?
A. Common, anyway.
Q. Next item was failure to safeguard checks. And Mr. Ziler testified a little bit about this, but could you describe what your concerns were?
A. Well, there are several reports that discuss the fact that the checks were out in the open, they weren't accounted for, the check writing machines were available to people who might not be authorized to use them, check signing plates were available. So it would be not difficult for an unauthorized person to write what appears to be a valid check.
Q. Okay. In your review, did you find instances of actual erroneous distributions or actual theft of IIM funds?
A. Yes, there were several reports that referred to identified theft and some erroneous distributions.
Q. And the Court has already seen the 1914 report that talked about that. Do you recall that one?
A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: If we could just look at some more recent
examples. 1974, item 210.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. What is this document?
A. This is an audit done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the Crow Indian Agency in Montana in 1974.
Q. And if you could turn to the link page. And could you describe for the Court what this is?
A. What this is showing is a number of unauthorized checks written on that account totaling $\$ 4,500$.
Q. And if you go to the next page, they actually have some details on those particular checks. Is that correct?
A. Right.

MR. SMITH: And if we could go, I believe it's five pages after that, page nine of the document.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you describe for the Court what this is?
A. This is a summary of the forged disbursements, so first line, for example, on August 12th, there are 42 forged checks; on the 21 st there were three batches of forged checks.
Q. If you could look at the comment on the bottom of the page, what does that indicate?
A. It says the administrative officer stated that the signature, apparently his signature on the check wasn't actually his.
Q. If we could look at another recent example, 1982 , item
number 216. And if we could link on the first page.
And is this another GAO report?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. It's a document you identified?
A. It's a document I reviewed.
Q. A document you reviewed. I'm sorry.

MR. SMITH: If we could go back to the link page and focus in on the first paragraph.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Is there an indication there that money in fact was going to people who had no authority to receive it?
A. It shows that names of 173 individuals who received trust fund checks were not shown on the list of authorized trust fund recipients.
Q. Okay. Another example, 1990, number 293. And is this a 1990 report from Arthur Andersen?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And again, one of the documents you reviewed?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it indicate as well that there's evidence of money being misappropriated?
A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: If we could go to the link page and focus in on, I believe, the third paragraph. BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And what does that reflect?
A. It says there have been instances of misappropriated funds due to inadequate safeguards over Treasury checks, and poor internal control over disbursement in general.
Q. And again, are these a handful of the items that you saw that reflected money going to the wrong people or being embezzled?
A. Correct.
Q. We've talked about your concerns about the disbursements. Let me change the focus a little bit. And in your review of these audits, did you identify instances where money was not disbursed?
A. Yes.
Q. For whatever reason?
A. Yes.
Q. And let's talk about some of the earlier years. Let's say pre-1930, what kinds of things did you identify?
A. Well, apparently there was a policy described in these reports in which the Trust simply did not pay money out to beneficiaries, or if they did, they paid very little, regardless of what the balance was in the account.
Q. And if you could, as an example, look at 1909 , item number
2.

MR. SMITH: 1909, I'm sorry.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And can you describe for the Court what this document is?
A. This is a report of the Department of Interior dated June 30th -- or for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1909.

MR. SMITH: And if you could go back to the linked page and focus in on the second paragraph.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And generally what does this describe?
A. What this describes is a procedure in which they were only paying $\$ 10$ monthly allowances to certain Indians, and the writer's belief that -- and the instructions were issued to discontinue even the $\$ 10$ payments.
Q. Except in certain circumstances?
A. Right.
Q. And was this typical of some of the reports you saw in earlier years?
A. Yes, there were several reports that talk about this sort of thing in the earlier years.

MR. SMITH: If we could look at 1915, item number 16. Go a little further.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Let's go ahead. Maybe we can figure out that one.

In some of the later years, did you find instances where money was supposed to be disbursed but it just for whatever reason was not?
A. Yeah, there were examples where balances had accumulated,
that there were problems distributing funds that had accumulated, there were problems with minors who had aged out and were unaware that funds were available to them.
Q. Let me give you an example. 1935, number 23. And what is this document? I believe it's dated November 28, 1935.
A. Yeah, it's a report on IIM funds at --
Q. Does it appear to be the Colville agency?

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Objection, Your Honor, leading.
THE COURT: Well, I think that's foundational. He's
trying to get him to read a fuzzy word at the top of the page. I think it says Colville.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Does it appear to be Colville?
A. It looks like Colville.
Q. If you could move to the actual linked page and focus in on the third full paragraph.
A. It's referring to an effort to exercise restraint in paying out funds to individual beneficiaries.

MR. SMITH: Let's look at item number 57, 1955.
THE COURT: After this one we're going to take a short break.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Could you describe what this document is?
A. This is a GAO report on audits at Anadarko, Oklahoma for the year ended June 30, 1955.
Q. Is this one of the documents you reviewed as well?
A. Yes.
Q. And under the first paragraph, what is indicated there?
A. They're looking at some of the accounts and they've found that 14 separate accounts totaling about $\$ 5,000$ were as much as eight years old.
Q. Okay.

MR. SMITH: Does Your Honor want to take a break?
THE COURT: Yeah, just a couple of observations on particularly the recent stuff you've been showing him, Mr. Smith. Reluctance in 1909 to pay $\$ 10$ to Indians because it might make them lazy, which $I$ think is what that whole thing is all about.

MR. SMITH: That's the implication.
THE COURT: Or restraining themselves from making payments in later years doesn't mean -- doesn't affect the disbursement schedules. It may affect the policy by which the schedules are made, but $I$ don't see how it impacts the legitimacy of the disbursement numbers.

And as to the many examples you've shown me of fraud, waste, and abuse, and all of the subcategories of it, that's kind of a double-edged sword, isn't it? I mean, if the money was paid out, how was it held for the benefit of the government? Think about that and let's talk about it later. We'll be in recess for 10 minutes.
(Recess taken at 3:17 p.m.)

THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Smith, proceed.

MR. SMITH: Your Honor, do you want me to respond to your questions or proceed with the examination?

THE COURT: No, let's proceed with the witness. We can talk about the question later. I just wanted to sort of throw a marker down and we'll talk about it later.

MR. SMITH: Okay. That's great.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Mr. Pallais, we've looked at a lot of examples, and is it fair to say you could point to other examples where money was not disbursed from the IIM Trust?
A. Yes.
Q. And that goes throughout the decades?
A. Yes.
Q. As an accountant, what kinds of issues does this raise with you?
A. Well, it raises questions about whether the money is going out, to who it's supposed to be going to. And if it's not going out, what's happening to it.
Q. In light of the pervasive problems that you saw over the hundreds of years of the Trust, what conclusions did you reach regarding the ability to rely on Interior's own distribution data?
A. I think you can't really rely on their distribution numbers
to represent valid payments to valid individual Indian beneficiaries.
Q. And were the problems that you noted, were they better pre-1972 or post-1972, or were they the same?
A. There were problems throughout. They were sometimes different problems, but there were problems throughout. MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I have no further questions. THE COURT: Cross-examine, Mr. Siemietkowski? MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Pallais.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. You're an expert in accounting and accounting procedure and methods, are you not?
A. Yeah, I suppose. Yeah.
Q. You're not an expert in government records, are you?
A. No.
Q. You're not an expert in federal Indian relations, are you?
A. No, sir.
Q. You're not an expert in federal Indian records, are you?
A. No.
Q. You have not reviewed any of the actual government records underlying the IIM accounts, have you?
A. No.
Q. You just reviewed reports about those records, as you've discussed in your direct examination. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So, for instance, you have not reviewed Treasury settlement packages?
A. That's correct.
Q. You have not reviewed GAO settlement packages?
A. Correct.
Q. You have not reviewed any statements of differences.

Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know what a statement of difference is?
A. I'm not sure I do. I'm going to say I don't, although I'm thinking there might have been an example in the October -- in some of the materials I looked at in October. But I'm not sufficiently confident to describe it.
Q. You have not reviewed any statements of accountability, have you?
A. Statements of accountability? You mean individual statements to Indians, or the IIM's accountability, the financial statements?
Q. Statements of accountability as prepared by BIA in the context of the IIM system. Have you seen any of those?
A. I don't believe I've seen what you're probably referring to.

I mean, the financial statements of the IIM would be a statement of accountability, but $I$ don't think that's what you're talking about.
Q. You haven't reviewed any statements of funded checking accounts, have you?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know what those are?
A. Statements of funded checking accounts? I could surmise, but I haven't actually looked at one.
Q. You have not reviewed any Osage documents, have you, Mr. Pallais?
A. No, I have not.
Q. You have not reviewed any judgment and per capita documents, have you?
A. No.
Q. You have not reviewed any electronic fund transfers records, have you?
A. No.
Q. Beyond the reports which you testified about on direct examination, you have not actually looked at any receipts data, have you?
A. Not any original data. I clearly have seen $A R-171$, for example, and other things that have been introduced at trial, but $I$ haven't seen any original detail data.
Q. Likewise, Mr. Pallais, you have not actually looked at any
original disbursement data, have you?
A. Not a lot. There have been copies of things in reports, but I have not seen any outside of reports.
Q. Now, regarding the reports, Mr. Pallais, which reports that you have reviewed provide evidence of what percentage of monies collected by the IIM system have been disbursed to beneficiaries?
A. I don't believe any of the reports describe that particular statistic.
Q. Similarly, which reports that you have reviewed provide evidence of what percentage of monies collected by the IIM system ought to have been disbursed to beneficiaries?
A. Again, I don't believe any of the reports say that. What the reports talk about is the lack of reliability of the recorded amounts, but they don't provide the statistic you are requesting.
Q. And can you point to any particular reports, Mr. Pallais, that you have reviewed that provide evidence of a benefit to the government conferred by the IIM?
A. No.
Q. Now looking at what $I$ believe was PPX-61, your list of 10 major disbursement problems, do you recall that No. 7 was "Lack of address of account holders"?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you familiar with Interior's efforts to find WAU?
A. No.
Q. Do you know what WAU refers to?
A. I could guess, but I don't --
Q. Do you know what it stands for?
A. I could guess what it stands for, but I don't know for sure that's what it stands for.
Q. I have another question, please --

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Thank you, Antonio.
BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. I have another question, please, about your direct examination. You talked about all the reports in this historical compilation being in the NORC database. And how do you know that those reports are in the NORC database?
A. I don't know. I have not spoken to NORC. I was given disks and informed of their provenance, but I have not actually spoken to NORC and I have not audited the database.
Q. And just to be clear, you did not actually prepare the

73-page historical compilation from which you testified.
Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know who selected those particular reports, as opposed to selecting other reports?
A. No, I don't.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: If I could please see page five of the historical compilation.

THE COURT: Who is showing page five? Catina? Okay, it's up.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Thank you for your indulgence, Your Honor.

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Mr. Pallais, that refers to, you see those two bullets in the center of that page, 1928?
A. I see two bullets, yes. Do you want me to read them?
Q. No, no. You've read those two extracted quotations from the 1928 letter from the comptroller general, have you not?
A. I believe so.
Q. Have you read the entire letter from the comptroller general?
A. I don't know if $I$ read this entire letter or not. I read a number of entire reports, many, but I'm not sure.
Q. Well, let me then show you $D X-467$, and specifically page 104 of the same comptroller general letter.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: If we could please enlarge the highlighted portion for Mr. Pallais to read.

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Could you please read the highlighted portion, Mr. Pallais?
A. To myself, or --
Q. Out loud, please.
A. "The check register was however carefully scrutinized, and all large payments and payments listed for the purposes that
were of an unusual nature were inquired into. The impression prevailed that, with few exceptions, the disbursements were on the whole reasonable, and as a rule made for the purposes beneficial to the Indian concerned."
Q. Thank you. Now, were you aware this quote existed in the same 1928 letter from which those two extractions in the historic compilation were found?
A. I might have been. I don't know. I just don't recall whether I read this entire report or not.

THE COURT: Let me see the quoted portions again. MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: From Our DX, Your Honor?

THE COURT: From the compendium. No, I mean from the -- your point is that they were taken out of context. I want to see what the context is. 1928. Okay.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Now if the Court will indulge me, I would like to switch back to a plaintiffs' exhibit briefly one more time before switching back to defense exhibits. If it would possible to show, I believe it's number 23 in the Historical Compilation, the 1935 report which Mr. Pallais testified to. The 1935 report, number 23 in plaintiffs' Historic Compilation. And if it's possible to cursor down to the bottom of page three, I believe it is. Is it possible to cursor down a bit further, please? Is it possible to look at the next page, please? And a bit further, please, if possible.

My apologies to the Court, Your Honor. I cannot find
the quote I was looking for. And we will be using defense exhibits from now on.

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Now, Mr. Pallais, you testified regarding several reports listed on pages 19 to 33 of your historical compilation. And those discuss BIA -- or those are quotes from BIA auditor reports between 1956 and 1966. Do you recall testifying about some of those BIA auditor reports during that time frame?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you have not reviewed all of those auditor reports, have you?
A. If it was in the compilation, I have looked at every one of them. If they were in the database provided for the October trial, I read all of them.

So I think that answers your question.
Q. It does, thank you.

But you're not familiar, are you, with the BIA standard procedures associated with those audits?
A. No.
Q. Did you know that BIA's audit division visited these area offices annually?
A. No.
Q. Did you know, for instance, that auditors usually spent one to three weeks at an agency, reviewing IIM records?
A. No.
Q. Did you know that the auditors conducted an exit interview with the area officer at the conclusion of the visit?
A. I didn't know that. I would have assumed it.
Q. Are you aware that the auditors submitted their reports to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs?
A. I would not have -- I would not know who the reports were actually sent to.
Q. Did you know that the commissioner's office submitted the auditor's findings back to the area office?
A. No, but that makes sense.
Q. And were you aware that those submissions typically
contained instructions to correct the deficiencies noted?
A. No, I did not know that.
Q. Now, on pages 34 and 35 of the compilation --

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: And if it's possible to show those,
I would like to as well. Thank you.

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. On pages 34 and 35 , Mr. Pallais, do you see reports
referenced in 1969 and 1972?
A. I see something for 1969 and for 1972.
Q. Okay. And those are OSR reports, are they not?
A. The ones for 1972 are.
Q. Are you aware that the 1972 report was a follow-up to the 1969 report?
A. If $I$ knew that, $I$ don't recall it.
Q. You do know, though, that OSR stands for Office of Survey and Review?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. Did you know that that was a precursor to the Office of the Inspector General?
A. No, I did not.
Q. I would like to show you DX-76, if I could, please. And specifically, page seven of DX-76. This is the 1972 OSR report.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: If we could enlarge that so the
Court and the witness could see that, please.
BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Would you please read that to yourself, Mr. Pallais, and tell me when you're finished reading it.
A. (Witness complies.) I have read them. You just want the three highlighted?
Q. Excuse me?
A. You just want the three highlighted?
Q. Yes, please.
A. Yes, I've read those.
Q. Now, at the time you reviewed those extracted quotes in the compilation, were you aware that this language also existed in the 1972 OSR report?
A. I don't recall being aware of that.
Q. I would like to take you from page seven of this same exhibit to page two of this same exhibit, please.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: If we could please expand that so the Court and the witness could see it.

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Could you please read the yellow highlighted section to yourself and tell me when you're finished, Mr. Pallais?
A. (Witness complies.) I've read that.
Q. Were you aware that language existed at the time you reviewed the compilation of quotes from that same report?
A. I don't recall seeing this one before.
Q. Now, on page 35 of your compilation, Mr. Pallais, you cite, and earlier I believe you discussed a 1974 accountant's report for the Crow Agency. Do you see that on the screen, Mr. Pallais?
A. I see that. You keep referring to "my report" and "that I referred to." But it's not my report and I didn't make this reference. But $I$ do see it.
Q. Right, this is not your compilation, as you testified. But you do see the 1974 bullet there?
A. Yes.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: If I could please show the witness DX-469, and specifically page two.

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. You recall testifying about these forgeries. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. On direct examination?
A. Right.
Q. Once it comes up large enough on the screen, Mr. Pallais, would you please read out loud the yellow highlighted portion? A. "The irregularities reported on herein are currently under investigation by representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Secret Service."
Q. Were you aware of this particular portion of the report when you earlier discussed the other portions in your direct examination?
A. I don't know if $I$ was or not. I'm not certain this would have affected my perception at all. So if I had read it, it would not have mattered to me.
Q. Now, page 35 of the compilation also cites a 1981 OIG report, and the gist of that was that IRMS was a mistake. Do you see that on your screen?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Were you aware that in that very same report that the statement is made that IIM was excluded from review?
A. No.
Q. Would that change any weight you gave to that particular bullet on the screen now?
A. No, not at all. I didn't refer to this in my testimony. Whether IIM was included or not, would not have been affected by that piece of information.
Q. Let me move if $I$ could to page 47 of the historic
compilation. This is the last example I'll discuss with you, Mr. Pallais, of one of the reports cited in the 73 -page compilation.

Now, at page 47 do you see the reference, and if it could be enlarged a bit, do you see the reference to the 1989 Arthur Andersen audit?
A. I'm sorry, which bullet should I be looking at now?
Q. I believe you testified to it earlier. The bullet regarding the 100 percent with the negative confirmation. Yes, that one right there. Do you recall testifying about that in your direct examination?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Now, you testified about this on direct but $I$ want to clarify a few things. This particular bullet states that negative confirmation messages were typed on the December 1988 statements that went to account holders. That's what it says. Right?
A. Right.
Q. And the bullet further states that 100 percent of the account holders had complaints about the statements they received, or generally about mismanagement. Right?
A. 100 percent of the responses they got back, yes.
Q. Correct, exactly. 100 percent of the responses received. Correct?

Now, I just want to make sure $I$ understood your direct.

A negative confirmation is one of three types of confirmation requests that an auditor might send a recipient or customer. Correct?
A. One of three kinds?
Q. Yeah. The other two being positive and blank?
A. Okay. Yeah, I would consider blank to be a kind of positive. But yeah, if you want to divide it up that way, yes. Q. And just to be clear, in a negative confirmation, Mr. Pallais, the recipient or customer replies only if the recipient disagrees with the balance provided or with the information provided. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Thank you.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Thank you, Matthew.
BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Now, regarding the reports more generally cited in the 73-page compilation, none of those reports discuss loss from the IIM system of, say, a billion dollars, do they?
A. I don't recall any of them referring to a loss of a billion dollars, that's correct.
Q. None discussed loss of a million dollars, do they?
A. There is a substantial number that discuss amounts that have been diverted. Whether it's a loss to any individual entity, I guess I would have to look at each of the comments in context to determine whether any of them are phrased that way.
Q. But you don't recall seeing any kind of numbers on that magnitude, do you?
A. Of loss? Certainly not a billion dollars, no.
Q. Now, I want to turn again to some of your testimony regarding your major disbursement problems. Number one on that list is "Lack of authorization for disbursements to beneficiaries and third parties." Do you remember testifying about that?
A. Yes.
Q. And in fact, also in your expert report of last August, you also discussed that on page 26. Do you remember that?
A. No.

MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: Would you please show page 26 of Mr. Pallais' August 2007 report?

BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. All right. Would you please read for the record, Mr. Pallais, the second and third highlighted portions of that?
A. I'm sorry, to myself or into the record?
Q. Out loud, please.
A. "Tests of disbursements are subject to the following potential weaknesses. The tests do not include obtaining any evidence of authorization by the account holder except in the case of payments to third parties."
Q. Now, that's consistent with your testimony today, is it not?
A. I'm not sure I'm getting your point. This has to do with
the tests the auditors were going to do, and my testimony today had to do with IIM procedures.
Q. Right. But similarly to what you say in your report, today you identified as a major disbursement problem lack of authorization for disbursements.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And that was identified as number one on your list.

Correct?
A. That was the first one on the list.
Q. I understand. I understand. Now, are you aware, Mr. Pallais, that funds in IIM accounts are automatically disbursed to the beneficiary upon reaching $\$ 15 ?$
A. No, I was not.
Q. Are you aware that for oil and gas payments, such automatic disbursements go to the beneficiary upon reaching $\$ 5$ ?
A. No. I didn't audit these amounts. All I can tell you is what the auditors observed as weaknesses in the system. So I presume, if the auditor was criticizing lack of authorization, they were aware of whatever these rules were.
Q. So you wouldn't be aware, for example, that's been the practice at least since the 1960s?
A. No, I wouldn't. I don't know whether those were the disbursements being criticized by the auditors over the years or not.
Q. And in fact, you have not actually spoken to any Indian
beneficiaries about disbursements, have you?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Likewise, you have not spoken to any individual
beneficiaries about receipts, have you?
A. That's correct.
Q. The only documents that you reviewed were those provided to you by plaintiffs' counsel. Correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You did not research and find any documents on your own, did you?
A. No, I did not.
Q. You have not met any OHTA accountants?
A. No.
Q. You have not met any OHTA contractor accountants?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. You have never been to Lenexa?
A. You asked me that in October. I have not been there since October.
Q. Right, thank you. You have not analyzed the LSA report, have you?
A. No.
Q. So of course you're not aware of the LSA error rate, are you?
A. No.
Q. You have not been to any Interior facilities in Albuquerque,
have you?
A. No.
Q. You have not been to any Federal Records Centers, have you?
A. No.
Q. Nor to any National Archives facilities?
A. No.
Q. In the documents you've reviewed, Mr. Pallais, you haven't seen any direct evidence of unaccounted-for accumulation of funds, have you?
A. I'm going to say no, the way you phrased that.
Q. In a similar vein, in the documents you've reviewed, you have not seen any direct evidence of the government benefitting from any accumulation of IIM funds, have you?
A. I have no idea what the government might have benefitted from or not. The audit reports don't talk about that.
Q. In fact, none of the reports in this 73 pages talk about that, do they?
A. I'm not sure that's true.
Q. Can you point to any that do?
A. No, I can't offhand. But I cannot say that the statement you made is true. It may be, but I don't know. I did not review the reports with that in mind. And I can envision situations where that would not be the case, but I just can't testify that it is.
Q. Now, you're aware, are you not, Mr. Pallais, that plaintiffs
in many instances rely upon the same historic documents in calculating both their collections and disbursement figures? A. They might. I have not made much of a study of how plaintiffs calculate receipts or disbursement figures.
Q. So you're not aware of which documents they pulled their figures from?
A. I might have read it, but it's not something that I paid a lot of attention to.
Q. Well, let me ask you this, Mr. Pallais: Are you aware at all that the plaintiffs used government records in calculating the $\$ 58$ billion which they seek?
A. I believe that --

MR. SMITH: Objection. This is outside the scope of direct, and irrelevant to his testimony.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, repeat the question. BY MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI:
Q. Are you aware, Mr. Pallais, at all, that the plaintiffs have used government records in calculating the $\$ 58$ billion which they request?

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.
MR. SIEMIETKOWSKI: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Smith?
MR. SMITH: Just a few questions, Your Honor.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. You were asked about whether you knew if the documents were provided to you from the NORC database. Do you recall that? A. Yes.

MR. SMITH: And if you could just pull up, for example, Document 18, 1928.
A. Yes.

BY MR. SMITH:
Q. And is there a Bates stamped number NORCMA?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that on a number of these documents that you reviewed, either NORCMA or NORCMAP?
A. Yes, I recall seeing those.
Q. Next question: You were asked about the selection of the documents in this report. Of all the audits that you reviewed, and you said you've reviewed 300-some back in October, and you reviewed even more now, how many of those audits would you describe as positive audits?
A. I would say of the 300 I reviewed in October, there weren't more than a handful, five perhaps, that did not have criticisms of internal control at the IIM facilities.
Q. Okay. There's a document that you were shown regarding the 1928 report.

MR. SMITH: Could we pull that up? It's a defendant's exhibit, the highlighted language. 1928 report, 467. I'm sorry, 469. I'm sorry, that's not the one. We were looking at
1928.

Your Honor, I'll move ahead.
BY MR. SMITH:
Q. Do you recall, you were asked about the 1928 document, and there's a reference to check registers for major disbursements?
A. I remember answering a question about that, but I would have to look at the document. It's not something I saw before today.

And frankly, I never really got the chance to look at the additional document $I$ was shown today to see how if at all it related to the comments in the compilation. But I didn't get a chance to do that. I was only asked whether I was aware of it.
Q. You were asked by Mr. Siemietkowski whether you were aware that after an audit there would be instructions to the agency to correct the problems. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. In your review of the audits, as a routine matter, were the problems corrected or did they recur?
A. Most of the problems continued to recur past -- certainly past the 1970s, when this policy apparently was in place.
Q. Okay. And you were asked about a 1972 audit where it was suggested there were matters that significantly improved. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. What happened by 1982, when Arthur Andersen stepped in? I'm
sorry, the GAO looked at it, or the comptroller?
A. Well, there continued to be problems. There were -regardless of what improvements there might have been, the story across 30 years after that was that there continued to be problems over controls on disbursements.
Q. Okay. And finally, you were asked about accumulation of IIM funds, and you expressed some hesitancy the way the question was worded. What was your hesitancy?
A. I don't recall specifically that the -- there were comments in the reports about amounts not being paid out, and there was some question in my mind whether his question encompassed those or not. And ultimately I concluded that I didn't think his question technically encompassed that, so I agreed with Mr. Siemietkowski's proposition. But it requires a certain level of sentence parsing to get there.
Q. Okay. But is it fair to say that you did identify instances within the audits where money was supposed to be paid out that was not?
A. That's correct.

MR. SMITH: No further questions, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Pallais, I think that completes your testimony. Thank you. You may step down.

Mr. Dorris?
MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we have some administrative matters in terms of moving in some exhibits. I don't know if
you want it before we rest, if you want to take that up now, or you prefer to move on with a witness and us take that up at some other point.

THE COURT: You're through with witnesses?
Does the government have a witness?

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's call -- let's deal with the
administrative matters later. Thank you. But are you telling me that except for those administrative matters, the plaintiffs rest?

MR. DORRIS: That is correct, Your Honor.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, and with that, I want to inform the Court that defendants plan to file a Rule 52 (c) motion later today, and would like --

THE COURT: It will be deemed filed now.

MR. KIRSCHMAN: And we would like an opportunity to
argue that briefly tomorrow.
THE COURT: All right.

MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, may I approach the witness
stand to get an exhibit?
THE COURT: Don't hurt anybody up there.
MR. DORRIS: Is that a yes?

THE COURT: That's a yes.
MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.
MR. KIRSCHMAN: Your Honor, to let you know, our first
witness will be Michelle Herman. And following her will be Dr. Ed Angel, both of whom you have heard from in October. THE COURT: All right.

MR. QUINN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael Quinn for the defendants.

THE COURT: Mr. Quinn.
MR. QUINN: We would like to call Ms. Michelle Herman to the stand.

THE COURT: Very well.
(Oath administered by Courtroom Deputy.)
(MICHELLE HERMAN, DEFENDANT witness, having been duly sworn, testified as follows:)

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Good afternoon. Would you please state your name for the record?
A. Michelle Herman.
Q. Welcome back. You testified and spent some time with us and the judge in the hearing last October. Is that right?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. If you could just refresh our memory here, collective memory, and give us just a brief recap of the topics you testified about last October.
A. Yes. I testified about our data completeness validation reports, the accounting reconciliation tool, the litigation
support accounting effort, and the land-to-dollar testing, as well as our work on throughput.
Q. I'm sorry, what was the last part?
A. Our work on the throughput estimate.
Q. Are you referring to a document that was numbered as AR-171?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Are you still employed with FTI Consulting?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And your title currently today?
A. Managing director.
Q. Is that the position you held last October when you testified?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And if you could just briefly remind us of the area of the company in which you work.
A. I work within the technology practice in a group referred to as financial and enterprise data analytics.
Q. And how long have you been with FTI?
A. Since November 2003.
Q. And I believe you testified last fall you had been involved, employed by other consulting firms. Is that right?
A. Yes. Prior to FTI, I was employed by KPMG. And prior to KPMG, by Arthur Andersen.
Q. And while employed with those firms and now with FTI, have you had occasion to work on matters pertaining to the Individual

Indian Money accounts?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Did your work involve the study of IIM account data, bookkeeping records, as well as Interior's bookkeeping practices for IIM historically?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Would you say that most of your professional career has been devoted to the examination and study of the Indian Trust records and Interior's bookkeeping practices historically?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. In fact, how long have you been working with respect to individual Indian accounting and data?
A. Since January 1997.
Q. And does that include work involving detailed financial examination of the IIM system?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. Your college education, your business degree came from what school?
A. The University of California at Berkeley.
Q. And your degree is in what field?
A. In business administration.
Q. I know this is a very broad question, but could you just list the major projects that you've participated in since 1997 that relate to the IIM system in some way or another?
A. Our initial work with the information was gathering data
from the IRMS system that was located on backup tapes, and restoring that data and creating a database with all of the information from February of '85 forward.

Our next --
Q. What system was that where the data was coming from?
A. The IIM subsystem within the IRMS system.
Q. Okay.
A. Our next major project was a document search and collection effort that was referred to as Paragraph 19. Subsequent to the Paragraph 19 collection effort, we worked with OHTA on designing and executing their historical accounting plan.
Q. Okay. And the Paragraph 19, when you described that, what was the -- what did the project entail that you were doing?
A. We worked both with the Interior Department and the Treasury Department to locate documents related to the five named plaintiffs and their agreed-upon predecessors.
Q. Do you remember how many agreed-upon predecessors were involved in that examination?
A. Approximately 31.
Q. Were you looking just for accounting information relating to these individuals?
A. No. Any information that we could locate relative to those individuals.
Q. And then you mentioned you worked in connection with the Office of Historical Trust Accounting?
A. That's correct.
Q. What did you -- what were you engaged to do for them?
A. We've worked with OHTA on numerous projects, ranging from assisting with writing the plans that they've submitted to data completeness validation and accounting projects.
Q. Could you describe the accounting projects that you've been involved in?
A. The Litigation Support Accounting, which was the reconciliation of sampled and high-dollar transactions.
Q. And what types of work did you do specifically with respect to that?
A. We assisted in designing the tool that was utilized to actually perform the accounting work, as well as reconciling transactions that had been selected.
Q. Are you referring to the ART program?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is that the computer program you demonstrated for the Court last fall?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And what is that? Again, briefly, what is that used for?
A. The ART program itself contains the financial transactions, as well as the supporting documentation and the resulting product of the accounting firm's analysis.
Q. For what class of information?
A. For the sampled -- well, all of the transactional data is
contained within the ART, documents that have been gathered over time, both in connection with the LSA project and other projects that OHTA has performed, in addition to the results from the accounting firm, specifically from the LSA project.
Q. What specifically were you doing in connection with the account reconciliation?
A. I assisted in designing the tool itself, and actually reconciled transactions.
Q. As part of the LSA?
A. Yes.
Q. As part of that project, about how many reconciliation -- I don't know how you count them, but how many reconciliations of accounts did you -- were you involved in?
A. We reconciled approximately 6,500 transactions.
Q. And then $I$ think you mentioned data completeness validation. Could you describe what that task involved?
A. Yes. We were measuring the completeness of the electronic data as it exists today relative to the data when it was process the historically.
Q. And where was that data -- what data were you testing?
A. Initially, we were testing the IRMS data, and later we added the TFAS data to that database.
Q. Did you produce -- provide some reports that were entered as exhibits at your testimony last fall?
A. Yes, I did. We produced six regional reports and one
overall report last year.
Q. As part, up to that report date last October, are the report dates September?
A. September 2007.
Q. As of that date, the report date, about how many
transactions had you and your team studied?
A. Approximately 114 million.
Q. 114 million?
A. That's correct.
Q. Through last October. Is that project continuing?
A. Yes, it has.
Q. Are you anticipating FTI will provide additional reports?
A. Yes. We're going to provide eight regional reports this

September, and a new overall report.
Q. So does that mean that there are two new regional reports in this next round of reporting?
A. Yes. There are two new regional reports, plus the additional work that we've performed on the initial six regions.
Q. I take that to mean then that you have continued to work on the DCV testing since you testified last fall. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. About approximately how many transactions have you examined as of today?
A. As of today, it's just over 119 million.
Q. You're up to 119 million?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you have any involvement in land-to-dollar pilot testing?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Can you describe what that testing involved?
A. We were involved in the pilot test at the Horton Agency, and the purpose of that test was to evaluate whether or not funds had been collected that were not in fact posted to the IRMS or TFAS systems.
Q. And have you more recently been requested to undertake analysis of collections, further analysis of collections into the IIM system?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And what was the purpose of that project?
A. To update AR-171 to provide a better estimate of collections and disbursements.
Q. And have you prepared an update to AR-171, that table?
A. Yes, I have.

MR. QUINN: Could we put up AR-171?
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. With respect to the preparation of the original AR-171 that you testified about last fall, do you recognize that document? A. Yes, I do.
Q. What work did you do leading up to the preparation of the document that got filed with the Court?
A. AR-171?
Q. Yes.
A. Our firm had gathered information from both NORC and Morgan Angel and Clifton Gunderson for some of the earlier years, and we had performed work from ' 86 forward using the IRMS and TFAS data.
Q. Just so the record is clear, you've identified three organizations. Could you specify what their role was?
A. Yes. The information from 1909 through 1971 was an estimate initially provided by NORC of total collections. And from 1972 through 1985 was information gathered by Clifton Gunderson.
Q. And who are they?
A. They are another accounting firm employed by OHTA. And some of the balance data at that point had been gathered by Dr. Angel and Morgan Angel \& Associates.
Q. And what kind of work did they do?
A. They gathered historical records that they provided to me.
Q. Are they accountants?
A. Clifton Gunderson is, but the other two firms are not.
Q. What do you understand Morgan Angel, their firm to be?
A. Morgan Angel \& Associates is a historian firm.
Q. With your appearance today, how many times have you testified in this case?
A. This is the third time.
Q. And besides last October, when else did you testify?
A. In what's referred to as Trial 1.5.
Q. Do you remember approximately when that was?
A. No, I'm sorry, I do not.
Q. In each case before, have you testified as a fact witness?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And are you here today to testify based on your own personal knowledge and experience in working with the Department of Interior over the last 11 years?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Let's see if we can give the Court of a preview of your testimony at this hearing.

What matters have you and FTI been working on since you testified last year, besides the data completeness validation work you've described?
A. We continued work on the paper era accounting, and we've continued work to update AR-171.
Q. Okay. What work has FTI done with respect to updating AR-171?
A. We've worked with Morgan Angel \& Associates to gather additional historical documents with NORC to assist in preparing the early year estimates, and to refine our double-counting analysis during the later years.
Q. And have you in fact prepared an updated table?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And are you prepared to talk about that in the course of
this hearing?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Have you also been asked by Department of Interior to study consolidated records relating to the IIM system?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And when did you undertake that research?
A. That began several months ago.
Q. Could you briefly describe the kinds of research that you've conducted since you began the project?
A. We've worked with Morgan Angel \& Associates in an attempt to identify historical reports that would report IIM collections and disbursements at an aggregate level.
Q. Are you prepared to testify today about your personal knowledge from your experience in working with the IIM data, and from your research into the historical records about IIM accounting, concerning the historical flow of funds in the IIM system?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Did you happen to prepare a diagram relating to your study of the flow of funds?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. There's a poster over here to your right. Is that a diagram that you prepared?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. QUINN: Your Honor, for purposes of identification
in the record, we have marked a paper copy of the same diagram as Defendant's Exhibit 370. It's the exact same, just a paper-sized version of the chart. I would like to offer it to the Court. It might be easier to read.

THE COURT: All right.
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Are you prepared today to describe what you've observed in the historical flow funds through the IIM system as represented in your diagram?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Let's talk about your chart. We'll come back to some of the other topics you may address later.

What did you study in the IIM system that led you to the diagram that's up here on the poster and in Exhibit DX-370? A. The primary information that we studied was the IRMS and TFAS data from 1985 through 2000, supplemented by the historical reports gathered by Morgan Angel \& Associates.
Q. And what were you looking for?
A. To identify the ways that monies were collected into, moved within the system, and were disbursed from the system.
Q. How is that historical flow of funds relevant to the issue of collections and disbursements, the throughput issue?
A. It helps explain how monies come into the system, how they may be double counted within the system, and how to classify the monies within the system into different revenue categories.
Q. And when you talk about the system, the IIM system, how would you describe your understanding of that term? What do you mean when you say IIM system?
A. All the monies that come into IRMS or TFAS, regardless of the source of those monies.
Q. And what's your understanding of those fund flows based on?
A. Based on the 11 years of work that I've performed for the Interior Department.
Q. And you mentioned the additional work you've been
conducting. Is it also based on the work you've done that you mentioned since March?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. By your personal work on the IIM records and data over the last 11 years, and the additional work you said you've done recently, have you gained an understanding of how the IIM system is operated historically?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And that's reflected in what's been marked for identification as DX-370?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And that's the same as what's on our poster over here?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What does the diagram represent generally?
A. The collection of money into, the movement within, and the disbursement from the IIM system.
Q. And the information and experience you've had with the data, you're relying on -- what are you drawing on in terms of identifying those fund flows? What experiences?
A. Not only the data completeness validation work, but the accounting work that we've performed through the LSA project, some of the work that we performed with the Special Deposit Accounts, as well as historical records that we've analyzed through the Paragraph 19 effort and our work with Dr. Angel recently.
Q. I don't think we talked -- you mentioned the SDA work, Special Deposit Account work you just mentioned now. Could you describe what you were doing?
A. OHTA was tasked with distributing monies from Special Deposit Accounts that had a balance as of 2002, and we worked with them to identify monies in some of the higher-value accounts and the appropriate owners of those monies.
Q. And what information did you have to research? What records did you have to research in order to make -- provide that research assistance?
A. We had to create a complete account history for each Special Deposit Account that we were analyzing. To the extent that that wasn't contained within the electronic era, we had to go back and locate the paper ledgers, and then we had to identify the funds that had been distributed already from those accounts and the monies that were remaining in those accounts.
Q. Have you looked at other paper records more generally as -going back into the paper era, as part of your task of trying to understand the flow of funds historically?
A. I've looked at several audits that Dr. Angel located from the 1940s, some Commissioner of Indian Affairs reports from the early 1900s, some documents that we had located from the 1970s, in addition to the documents that have been collected to date for the paper ledger accounting.
Q. I would like to show you one of the exhibits.

MR. QUINN: Excuse me, Your Honor. We have a set of copies of exhibits we'll be using for plaintiffs.

Could you zoom in on the top part of that, just so the witness can see it better?

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. All right. This has been marked for identification as Defendant's Exhibit 485. Can you identify, describe what that -- have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Is this the sort of document that you just referring to, things that you looked at?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Could you just describe generally what this is?
A. This is a review performed by a BIA clerk of the Winnebago Agency, an audit of IIM accounts at that agency for the time frame of June 1st, 1938 through December 31st, 1939.
Q. And you looked back -- when you say you looked back into the paper era in terms of understanding fund flows, were you looking at documents similar to this?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And in fact, do you have some examples to share with the Court later today about the fund flows indicated in this exhibit?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. We'll come back to those records in a moment.

MR. QUINN: If you could put up DX-33. It's in
evidence. Zoom in on just the cover so we can see the cover better.

I believe this has been mentioned already in court, Your Honor, Defendant's Exhibit 33 in evidence, titled "Commissioner of Indian Affairs" -- "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," and the date for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910.

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Ms. Herman, have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Is this another sort of the paper era record you would have looked at as part of getting an understanding of the fund flows, looking at those in comparison to what you've seen in the electronic era?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. We'll come back to that in a moment.

Let's get an overview of what your diagram is displaying. I see it's divided into roughly three general parts. And let's just talk for a second about what the left side, the green section, is intended to show by your diagram.
A. The left section of the diagram is meant to reflect collections into the system.
Q. Okay. And the middle part, the middle section which is mostly blue, what is that intended to depict?
A. Transfers of monies within the system.
Q. And then the right third of your diagram, the gray boxes on the right, what is that intended to depict?
A. Disbursements from the system, and the people or parties to whom those funds are disbursed.
Q. Did you prepare some slides that can help step us through your diagram?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Ms. Herman, we've put up on the screen here slide one. Is this the first slide in your slide show?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Did you prepare this slide? Not the graphics, but the information that went into the slide presentation?

THE COURT: I think all of those formalities, you can sort of skip through those. This is her deal, she put it together. I understand that.

MR. QUINN: Fine, Your Honor. Let's go. Get the show on the road.

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Could you tell us about the very first box that's here, and what that represents?
A. The first box lists the type of income collected into the system; other receipts including timber, oil and gas, typical land-based income; Tribal IIM; judgment and per capita monies; Osage annuity payments; and interest monies.
Q. And there's a notation on the slide here at the bottom.

Could you describe what that is intended to show?
A. The total collections into the system, which is reflected in the update to $A R-171$, from the period 1887 through 2007 , were 14.3 billion.
Q. And you have a subsection there, 1985 to 2000 , of
4.6 billion. What does that indicate?
A. That's the amount of money collected during that time frame, which was the starting point for the analysis of these -- of this chart.
Q. Is that the era that you most closely studied?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Why didn't you study the entire 120-year history?
A. There would be a significant number of documents that you would have to gather to do that, and there simply wasn't enough time.
Q. In any case, you used the period through 2000. Why didn't you look into the more recent era as part of your investigation? A. Beginning in August of 1998 there was a conversion to the TFAS system, and beginning in March of 1999, the Tribal Trust and the individual trusts were held within the same system. And so it's a much more time-consuming effort to appropriately categorize those monies as tribal or individual.
Q. But if you had the time, you could take that and include that as part of your analysis?
A. Yes, I could.
Q. Based on your 11 years' experience studying the IIM system records, does your diagram also reflect historical flow of funds in the paper era, as well?
A. For the documents that I've analyzed to date, yes.
Q. Is your understanding -- that's based on the historical records you've looked at?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Let's talk about exactly what's in the box, the green box in the left third, that green section.

The labels in there look familiar to me. What do those represent?
A. Those are the labels from $A R-171$, as well as our update, DX-371.
Q. Are you saying these categories here refer back to these columns in the collections? (Indicating.)
A. Yes, they do.

MR. QUINN: And if we can zoom in to the top part, the left edge of the document, please. That's great. BY MR. QUINN:
Q. The first in the "Collections" category, Column B, is labeled "Interest." Could you describe what that covers?
A. That would include interest earned on individual and non-individual accounts in the IIM system.
Q. Is all interest that's been collected into the IIM system over its history appear in that category on your table?
A. No. Only the interest that we were identified, because it was coded as such.
Q. What do you mean, coded as such?
A. Within the electronic system there's a revenue code that indicates the type of income, and in many instances that labels the income as miscellaneous.

So this only includes income that's been labeled as interest or, to the extent that we had an investment report, interest in those reports.
Q. If there's some interest that's not in the interest column, does it appear elsewhere in the table?
A. It would be included in other receipts.
Q. That's Column F of $\mathrm{AR}-171$ ?
A. That's correct.
Q. So if you ignore Column B, the interest column, in totaling
up the collections, does that total still contain interest?
A. It would contain some interest.
Q. The next column, Column $C$ in $A R-171$, is labeled "Osage quarterly annuity." What does that cover?
A. That covers payments from the Osage tribe to headright owners that enter into the IIM system.
Q. Is all Osage headright income represented in that column?
A. No, it is not.
Q. Could you describe what is not -- what Osage headright income is not in that column?
A. There are some payments that are made directly from the Tribal Trust to owners of head rights, and that money would not be included in this column.
Q. So there's some money -- when you, on your diagram, look at the green box, look over here, is that the Osage annuity you're referring?
A. Monies paid directly from the Tribal Trust system would not be included in that green box.
Q. So what does that box represent, the Osage annuity in the box?
A. Only funds that were actually collected into the IIM system.
Q. If $I$ were to try to draw on this chart the Osage headrights income paid directly out of the Tribal Trust, where would I show it?
A. You would need to create another funds flow to represent
monies moving from the Tribal Trust.
Q. The next column in $A R-171$ is listed as "judgment/per capita." What does that cover?
A. That includes judgment funds and per capita payments from tribes that actually enter into the IIM system.
Q. And for years prior to, $I$ think it looks like 1986, there isn't an entry in the "judgment/per capita" column. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Does that mean there was no judgment or per capita money earned in those years, or received in those years?
A. No, it only means that we weren't able to separately identify them.
Q. So for an earlier period, if there is a judgment/per capita receipt, where would that be reflected on $A R-171 ?$
A. In the "other receipts" category.
Q. Column $E$ in $A R-171$ is the Tribal IIM, and $I$ think you testified about this last fall. Could you briefly describe what that includes?
A. That includes collections into what $I$ refer to as Tribal IIM accounts. Those accounts typically have a $T$ in the fourth character of the account number.
Q. You're talking about the letter "T," that's what they go by?
A. Yes.
Q. Is all tribal money that's in the IIM system in a T-labeled
account?
A. No, it is not.
Q. So does the Column E, Tribal IIM in $A R-171$, does that include all tribal money that's flowing through the IIM system?
A. No, it does not.
Q. Have you found examples of other Indian tribe money that is not Tribal IIM denominated as Tribal IIM?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And you have examples that we'll walk through later?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Other tribal money that's not here in the Tribal IIM column, where would it show up in your table?
A. In other receipts.
Q. That brings us to "Other receipts," $F$, in table AR-171. What collections fall into "Other receipts"?
A. As we discussed, to the extent that interest or judgment funds or per capita monies aren't specifically identified, they would be included in other receipts, in addition to what we refer to as land-based revenues. So land sales, oil and gas collections, timber payments, things of that nature.
Q. Are there other types of collections you've seen that come in that would fall into the other receipts total?
A. Yes. To the extent that bid deposits or bonds or things of that nature came into the system, they would be reflected in other receipts.
Q. How about money earned from a school play? Have you seen that?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you have an example of that to share with the Court later?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. How about money that's being held as part of a cemetery fund? Have you seen that in the IIM system?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. So in the course of your experience, have you come across such a variety of types of collections over the years?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. So in going back to 370 , if we could put slide one back on the screen, DX-370, and your green box of collections on the right, you've used the same labels in categorizing the types of selections. Is that right?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Why are they in reverse order from your table?
A. "Other receipts" is the primary category of revenue within the examples, so I've labeled that first.
Q. If we could go to slide two and ask you about the next part of your diagram. Going from the green box, you have two arrows, two green arrows. What do they represent?
A. In some instances, monies are posted directly to the individual accounts themselves when they're collected. In other
instances, the monies are posted to what I've referred to as non-individual accounts.
Q. That's the box at the top?
A. That's correct.
Q. In the blue box. The entire blue section, what does that represent?
A. The IIM system itself.
Q. And let's talk about the different parts that make up that center blue box. Does this represent the internal workings of the IIM system?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And you have two boxes, an upper box labeled "Non-Individual accounts" and lower, "Individual accounts." Why did you present it this way?
A. As I mentioned, in some instances monies post directly to those individual accounts, and in other cases the monies post to the non-individual accounts, at which point funds may transfer or may be disbursed.
Q. And let's look at the top box for a moment, labeled "Non-Individual accounts." You have some labels inside that box. Could you describe what those mean?
A. "SDA" stands for Special Deposit Account; "Tribal IIM" refers to the $T$ accounts that we were discussing earlier; and "Other administrative accounts" is a catch-all for the rest of the administrative accounts within the system.
Q. Could you give an example or two of the other administrative accounts that you've seen?
A. For instance, interest accounts within the system or mislabeled accounts within the system.
Q. Are there such things as bid deposit accounts?
A. Bid deposits could be within the SDA account or an escrow account.
Q. Could there be administrative accounts for collection of government fees?
A. Yes, that's possible.
Q. In your diagram where you say, "Non-Individual," what do you mean by that?
A. Monies that may or may not actually transfer to an individual account at the end of the day.
Q. So in this part of the process, do you know that they're individual?
A. No, not at that point.
Q. Do you know for sure that they're going to a trust account?
A. No, you do not.
Q. You have a circle around the "SDA" and "Tribal IIM" and other administrative -- an arrow in a circle. What does that reflect?
A. That there are actually transfers between administrative accounts within the system.
Q. You have a label on the arrow, "Admin-to-admin transfers."

Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Could you describe a typical type of
administrative-to-administrative transfer that you've seen?
A. For instance, when range payments are going to be paid out, in some cases you'll see a debit from all of the various range accounts for that particular agency, and a credit of all of those funds into one singular Special Deposit Account, to facilitate distribution.
Q. And did you bring some examples showing these kinds of administrative-to-administrative transfers?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And we'll talk about those after we get through your slides here.

Let's look at the lower part of the blue box that's labeled "Individual accounts." What funds are represented by that box?
A. Monies that are actually credited to individuals within the system. So land-based accounts refers to accounts where the primary source of revenue would be a lease, for instance. Q. Would these be accounts in the name of a particular recipient?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. And you have in there labeled "Land-Based," "Judgment," and
"Per Capita." Could you describe what you're intending to
depict there?
A. Land-based accounts would contain monies primarily from the use of land. So land sales, farm and pasture leases, range income, things of that nature.

Judgment accounts would typically be accomplished for a minor or someone deemed to be incompetent to receive judgment monies; similar to that would be per capita accounts.
Q. And you have a circle -- or an arrow in a circle going around those identified types of accounts that says,
"Individual-to-individual transfers." What are you depicting there?
A. In some instances you'll see transfers among individual accounts. A typical example would be either a probate or a land sale.
Q. Actually, a movement of money from one individual account to another?
A. That's correct.
Q. One arrow we haven't discussed is the one in the middle between the two boxes that says, "Transfers." Could you describe what that depicts?
A. Yes. To the extent that the monies collected into the non-individual section at the top of the chart are deemed to be individual monies, they're transferred down to the individual accounts.
Q. Is it possible that tribal money could move -- be
transferred that way as well?
A. Yes, that is possible.
Q. Have you seen that happen?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Could you give an example that you've seen of that type of tribal money moving into an individual account?
A. The most typical example would be a loan from the tribe to individual.
Q. A loan?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is it important to have an understanding about all the different types of internal transfers that you've described?
A. Such that you can reduce potential double-counting in your collection estimate.
Q. Last fall when you were talking about your DCV study, I believe you testified about a similar double-counting issue when studying postings. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. I would like to look back at that one exhibit that we discussed last October.

MR. QUINN: If we could go to DX-152A in evidence, at page 15. Can we zoom in on that?

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Do you recall your testimony about this example, Ms. Herman?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Describe what you were talking about here with respect to counting transactions as part of the data completeness analysis? A. This is when we were discussing the manner in which we count throughput for the data completeness validation reports. And we were discussing in essence that we would count each movement of money instead of the unique collection and the unique disbursement.
Q. Now, when you're over here talking about the collection and disbursement of funds over the history of the IIM system, do you want to count this way?
A. No, you do not.
Q. So what needs to be understood then about these internal transfers?
A. You need to be able to identify the transfers such that you can eliminate the double-counting.
Q. Going back to the upper box --

MR. QUINN: We can put the slide back up on the screen. Thanks.

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. The upper box labeled "Non-Individual accounts," why is it important, as far as understanding collections into the system and disbursements out, to have an understanding what happens to funds in the upper box on your diagram?
A. Some of those monies will eventually be transferred down to individual accounts, but some of those monies will be paid out
of the non-individual accounts.

MR. QUINN: If we could put DX-33 back up on the screen for just a moment. It's in evidence. And go to the right-hand chart at the top. Zoom in at the top, please.

BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Ms. Herman, you've seen this document before. Right?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And could you interpret this document in terms of your diagram, what it's showing in terms of the disbursements and where money is going in terms of your diagram?
A. Could you move it down, please, a little bit? Thank you.

This diagram is referring to the category of collections for this particular year. And there were total collections of $\$ 7.65$ million, and of those it gives three categories of disbursements; one, paid directly to Indians by disbursing officers; two, monies returned to unsuccessful bidders; and three, checks drawn by Indians on bank accounts. Q. Out of that example, is there any part of those disbursements that fall into your upper box?
A. At minimum, the monies referred to as returned to unsuccessful bidders would be included in that upper box. Q. Do you have a sense of what percentage that makes up of the total disbursements in that year?
A. It's roughly 35 percent.
Q. Let's go to your third slide and talk about the right third
of your diagram. Describe what this slide shows.
A. This slide illustrates the disbursements from the IIM system and the type of entity that may be receiving those monies.
Q. And at the bottom you have a notation about "Total
disbursements." Could you explain what your notation means?
A. From 1887 through 2007, there's approximately $\$ 13.7$ billion
disbursed from the Trust, and from 1985 through 2000, approximately 4.6 billion.
Q. And that subset you're referring to, the $\$ 4.6$ billion in disbursements, what does that refer to?
A. Again, that refers to the primary area we focused on from the electronic time frame.
Q. This time period, ' 85 to 2000 , is that the same period you focused on in terms of collections?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And are the same reasons you stopped it, in terms of the focus of your efforts in 2000 data year, for the same reasons you described in terms of the collections?
A. Yes.
Q. On the upper right-hand side there are three arrows pointing out from the IIM system. Could you describe what they represent?
A. The first is third parties, the second is the Tribal Trust, and the third is stakeholders.
Q. But what do the arrows represent going to those boxes?
A. I'm sorry, the movement of money from the IIM system to those categories of individuals or entities.
Q. Are you indicating there that that's movement of money out of non-individual accounts?
A. That's correct.
Q. This is money going out of the IIM system from non-individual accounts?
A. That's correct.
Q. So the converse of that is, that's money that not going out of individual Indian accounts in the IIM system?
A. Yes. Those funds would not have been transferred down to individual accounts.
Q. Let's go over the three boxes and what they represent in terms of the disbursements. The box at the top right is labeled
"Third parties." Who are third parties?
A. That would represent the return of bid deposits to an unsuccessful bidder; return of bonds, for instance upon completion of a lease; payment of administrative fees to the government for managing the lease. Things of that nature.
Q. Any other examples you can think of, sitting here?
A. I've seen payments of wages by a tribe to an employee.
Q. Have you seen indications of disbursements to Boy scouts or

Girl Scouts?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. I have a sense of the Tribal Trust, but could you describe
what that depicts, the next box down?
A. There's significant amount of money transferred out to the Tribal Trust from the IIM system.
Q. And when you say Tribal Trust, you're talking about that other trust system set up for handling tribal money?
A. That's correct.
Q. The last box in that top set of three are stakeholders.

Describe what this box refers to.
A. This includes direct payments. One of the larger categories would be of judgment or per capita monies or direct pay leases that are made from the non-individual section of the system.
Q. Are there other types beyond judgment/per capita?
A. I've seen leases paid directly from the non-individual accounts.
Q. How about, have you seen loan proceeds?
A. I'm sorry, I'm not clear on the question.
Q. I'm sorry. Have you seen land sale proceeds paid that way?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Last fall we heard testimony about direct pay arrangements. When you talk about stakeholder -- payments to stakeholders, are you referring to the direct pay arrangement?
A. No, not in this same context.
Q. How are they different? How are these different from direct pay arrangements, to your knowledge?
A. These are monies that actually entered into the IIM system,
and are being paid out from the non-individual accounts.
Q. But how are they similar to direct pay arrangements?
A. The funds are never transferred to an individual money account, a land-based account, for instance.
Q. The last box, the lower -- bottom box on your right-hand side says, "IIM beneficiaries." Could you describe what that illustrates?
A. These would be payments made from individual accounts to IIM beneficiaries or on their behalf.
Q. And what do you mean by "on their behalf"?
A. For instance, if an account holder is a minor, you may see a payment for school clothing or medical care.
Q. Now, on your slide -- it's not on your poster, but on your slide, the last frame there, you have a large bracket around all three boxes, with the indication of "Total disbursements." Can you describe what that illustrates?
A. That illustrates that the total disbursements for all four of those categories is 13.7 billion from 1887 through 2007.
Q. So is it correct, then, when you talk about total disbursements, you're talking about total disbursements out of the IIM system?
A. That's correct.
Q. Let's see if we can just recap on your illustration. With respect to the collections in your green box, does that include money, some money coming into the IIM system that is never
destined for deposit into an individual IIM account?
A. That's correct.
Q. Would I be correct to say that based on your own observation, that many credits that are posted to the IIM system involve the upper box, the non-individual accounts?
A. That's correct.
Q. And when something posts as a credit to the non-individual account box, does that mean it's, in that sense, in that transaction, not a posting to an individual IIM account? A. That's correct.
Q. In terms of your description here and your diagram, you have the non-individual accounts. And when you talk about the character of money being non-individual, how is that determined? I mean, how do you classify something as non-individual?
A. It's determined based on the type of disbursement. So if the monies flow down to an individual account, it would be considered individual. Or if it's moving out of the system to a third party or the Tribal Trust or a stakeholder, it would be considered non-individual.
Q. So that in a sense, then, the non-individual character of the money is determined by its destination?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that non-individual money includes money going to third parties?
A. That's correct.
Q. And to tribes?
A. That's correct.
Q. Unsuccessful bidders --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- and so forth? Okay.

Why is it useful to understand this part of the flow of funds through the IIM system?
A. To be able to determine the amount of monies that are actually deposited at the end of the day to individual accounts within the system.

MR. QUINN: Could we put up DX-365 for a moment?
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. I just want to ask you about one document that was discussed at the last trial, DX-365.

MR. QUINN: Could we zoom in on the top half of the
box, so we get the label?
BY MR. QUINN:
Q. Can you see that Ms. Herman?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Let's talk about it in terms of your document AR-171 and the work you've done, as far as the update to it that we'll be presenting to the Court.

Did you use any calculations from DX-365 in revising
the table, doing the revising of information on AR-171?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Have you -- looking at the table, on the far upper part of the chart, $A$, it has a column identified as "Total collections." Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And at the bottom number it has a number of $13,186,000,000$.

Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. What's your understanding of what that number includes?
A. That that's the total collection number from AR-171, less Tribal IIM monies.
Q. So less Tribal IIM. Does that mean we're talking about that one column that was in AR-171 as -- denominated as Tribal IIM?
A. That's correct.
Q. So based on your study of the flow of funds through this system, does this total that's indicated here, does that exclude or include the other tribal monies you've seen through this system that are not denominated as IIM?
A. This would include those other tribal monies.
Q. That would include those other tribal monies.

Would it include things such as bid deposits?
A. Yes, it would.
Q. Would it include undifferentiated interest, interest that you couldn't determine was interest at the time you did the
calculation?
A. All interest is included in this number.
Q. So in terms of your -- of this collections figure, it doesn't exclude everything that's in the non-individual accounts that you've identified in terms of fund flows over the history of the IIM system. Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you think of other things that didn't get deducted out of that total collections number, as far as you know?
A. For instance, the direct payments for judgment monies that were made that we were referring to, the stakeholder payments, things of that nature would not have been deducted.
Q. As a consequence of including these other non-individual monies in the collections figure on this DX-365 figure, what does that do to the total collections number?
A. It would overstate collections to individual accounts.
Q. So is it fair -- if you go down to the bottom chart, in Part B there's a list, do you see that, of estimated credits to IIM accounts?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Of 10 billion. Are those numbers comparable to one another?
A. No, they are not.
Q. Did you participate in -- did you prepare this DX-365 chart?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Have you used the computations in here as part of your
update to AR-171?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Based on what you know about the calculations you've made in AR-171, does the chart in $D X-365$ also include individual-to-individual transfers?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. In your flow of funds chart, $D X-375--$ or 370 , excuse me, does that diagram indicate how total collections as represented in DX-365 could overstate the amount of individual Indian account money that was in the system?
A. Yes, it could.

THE COURT: Mr. Quinn, it's 5:00 o'clock and I have another matter that $I$ have to attend to. And besides which, you have about reached my plateau with these numbers.

MR. QUINN: I try to make it interesting, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, it's fascinating. But at 9:30
tomorrow morning, we will start again. And I think I'm going to need a little bit of re-grounding in what this exhibit is, the one you've got up on the screen.

MR. QUINN: Okay.

THE COURT: Because I'm not quite sure I -- frankly, I think I missed where this comes from and how it relates to the other stuff. So let's start with that fresh at 9:30.

Thank you, everybody, for your attendance today. We'll be in recess until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

MR. QUINN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceedings adjourned at 5:06 p.m.)
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