1438	CONTENTS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, : Civil Action 96-1285	
et al. : Plaintiffs :	BRIAN PALMER By Mr. Gingold 1444
: Washington, D.C. V. : Tuesday, June 24, 2008	By Mr. Gingold 1444
: DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary :	
of the Interior, et al. : :	
Defendants : MORNING SESSION	
TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 9	EXHIBITS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
APPEARANCES:	NUMBER ADMITTED
For the Plaintiffs: DENNIS GINGOLD, ESQUIRE	
LAW OFFICES OF DENNIS GINGOLD 607 14th Street, NW	(No Exhibits Moved into Evidence.)
Ninth Floor Washington, DC 20005	
(202) 824-1448	
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, ESQUIRE WILLIAM E. DORRIS, ESQUIRE	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 1100 Peachtree Street	
Suite 2800 Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530	
(404) 815-6450	
KEITH HARPER, ESQUIRE JUSTIN GUILDER, ESQUIRE	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 607 14th Street, N.W.	
Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20005	
(202) 585-0053	
DAVID C. SMITH, ESQUIRE DANIEL R. TAYLOR, JR., ESQUIRE	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 1001 West Fourth Street	
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101 (336) 607-7392	
Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@ve</u>
1439	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@ver</u>
For the Defendants: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE	
JOHN WARSHAWSKY, ESQUIRE MICHAEL QUINN, ESQUIRE	1 PROCEEDINGS
J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE	2 COURTROOM DEPUTY: This is Civil Action 96-1285,
GLENN GILLETT, ESQUIRE	3 Elouise Cobell, et al. versus Dirk Kempthorne, et al.
IIS Department of Justice	
U.S. Department of Justice 1100 L Street, N.W.	4 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Warshawsky.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005	_
1100 L Street, N.W.	_
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001	 09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mails 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mails 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mails 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mail 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon.
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	 9:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon. 19 Now, we can live with that. We spent all weekend and
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mails 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon. 19 Now, we can live with that. We spent all weekend and 09:55:58 20 of course all day yesterday working with it. We got the late
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mails 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon. 19 Now, we can live with that. We spent all weekend and 09:55:58 20 of course all day yesterday working with it. We got the late 21 edition last night at 10:30 p.m. by e-mail. The models have
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I mails 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early 17 edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon. 19 Now, we can live with that. We spent all weekend and 09:55:58 20 of course all day yesterday working with it. We got the late 21 edition last night at 10:30 p.m. by e-mail. The models have 22 been apparently revised again. 23 We've
1100 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 307-0010 JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE Senior Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Commercial Litigation Branch Civil Division Ben Franklin Station P.O. Box 975 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 307-1104 Court Reporter: REBECCA STONESTREET Official Court Reporter Room 6511, U.S. Courthouse 333 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3249 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced	09:55:05 5 MR. WARSHAWSKY: Good morning, Your Honor. If I ma 6 for a moment just advise the Court of a situation. There was a 7 little slippage on the schedule over this weekend 8 THE COURT: I've just added 15 minutes to it, so 9 MR. WARSHAWSKY: We can live with that, Your Honor. 09:55:21 10 As the Court will recall, Thursday afternoon we were 11 advised that the plaintiffs initially intended to provide their 12 model to us on Friday, but they needed time to scan and copy the 13 materials to get to us on Saturday. 14 In fact, the materials ultimately were e-mailed to us 09:55:40 15 at 1:41 a.m. on Sunday morning, the first set of the materials. 16 The second part of the first set, I guess, was the early edition. We got the second set of the first set of materials at 18 1:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon. 19 Now, we can live with that. We spent all weekend and 09:55:58 20 of course all day yesterday working with it. We got the late 21 edition last night at 10:30 p.m. by e-mail. The models have 22 been apparently revised again.

		1442		1444
	1	but I did want to advise the Court ahead of time of where we	1	THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed.
	2	were just in case after hearing Dr. Palmer's direct we need to	2	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify
	3	ask the Court for additional time.	3	Exhibit 189-A, which is Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the
	4	THE COURT: All right.	4	government.
09:56:28	5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Thank you.	5	(BRIAN PALMER, PLAINTIFF WITNESS, having been duly sworn,
	6	THE COURT: Mr. Gingold?	6	testified as follows:)
	7	MR. GINGOLD: Good morning, Your Honor.	7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
	8	THE COURT: Good morning.	8	BY MR. GINGOLD:
	9	MR. GINGOLD: Everything Mr. Warshawsky said is	9	Q. Dr. Palmer, can you please describe what this is?
09:56:48	10	correct. However, the model hasn't changed, it's the data that	10:00:47 10	A. Yes. This is Attachment A that Professor Cornell
	11	is the subject of the modifications, Your Honor.	11	THE COURT: Can you speak up on that microphone a
	12	Your Honor, plaintiffs would like to call Brian Palmer.	12	little bit, please?
	13	(Oath administered by Courtroom Deputy.)	13	A. This is Attachment A that Professor Cornell had presented
	14	MR. GINGOLD: If we can put on the screen, Antonio,	14	earlier to this Court. The data in this attachment and for this
09:57:33	15	Plaintiffs' 182.	10:01:05 15	model has been revised.
	16	Your Honor, I will provide a brief background of	16	BY MR. GINGOLD:
	17	Dr. Palmer and briefly state what he is going to be testifying	17	Q. Did you prepare or help prepare did you help develop the
	18	to today.	18	model that Dr. Cornell testified to in this litigation?
	19	Your Honor, Brian Dr. Palmer is testifying because	19	A. Yes, I worked closely with Dr. Cornell. We worked together
09:57:54	20	of the unavailability of Professor Cornell, who is involved in	10:01:23 20	and I worked closely with him in developing the model that was
	21	testifying in another litigation unrelated to this case, and	21	originally prepared, and then worked to augment the data
	22	scheduling conflicts precluded continuing to postpone the	22	subsequently because of the information we learned in this
	23	deposition. So Dr. Palmer is sitting in for Dr. Cornell.	23	litigation.
	24	THE COURT: All right.	24	Q. Dr. Palmer, did you sit through the Defendant's
09:58:16	25	MR. GINGOLD: Dr. Palmer has a Ph.D. in economics from	10:01:43 25	case-in-chief?
		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
		1443		1445
	1	MIT, he has a BA in economics and a BS in economics, or a double	1	A. Yes, I was here for most of the witnesses.
	2	major from Brigham Young University. He has been with CRA	2	Q. Did you hear the testimony of Michelle Herman?
	3	International for 19 years, he specializes in econometrics and	3	A. I did.
	4	statistics, and his expertise in economic and quantitative	4	Q. Did you hear the testimony of Dr. Angel?
09:58:46	5	analysis has been employed in anti-trust, intellectual property,	10:01:55 5	A. Yes, I did.
	6	and a variety of other litigation related to financial issues.	6	Q. Did you hear the testimony of Dr. Kehoe?
	7	Page two of his CV identifies the fact that he has been	7	A. Yes, I did.
	8	a teacher in statistics at the Fletcher School of Law and	8	Q. And did you hear the testimony of Dr. Scheuren?
	9	Diplomacy, Tufts University, and he has been an instructor in	9	A. Yes, I did.
09:59:11	10	statistics at MIT.	10:02:05 10	Q. Did you review exhibits that were introduced by defendants
	11	Dr. Palmer is offered by plaintiffs as an expert in	11	in this proceeding?
	12	economics, econometrics and statistics. He's going to be	12	A. Yes, I did.
	13	explaining to this Court, based on his review of the testimony	13	Q. And did you also review the written testimony of defendants'
	14	and hearing of the testimony of defendants and exhibits, the	14	exhibits?
09:59:36	15	flow of funds into the Trust, the flow of funds out of the	10:02:17 15	A. Yes, I did.
	16	Trust, his calculation for the benefit conferred, and, in the	16	Q. The modifications you stated there were modifications
	17	alternative, an interest calculation for interest that	17	made in the data. Is that correct?
	18	plaintiffs believe the government would be obligated to pay our	18	A. That is correct. The model itself has not changed, it's
	19	clients.	19	just the input data that were used for the model have changed,
10:00:01	20	Your Honor, plaintiffs offer Dr. Palmer for this	10:02:40 20	from information learned.
	21	purpose.	21	Q. Information learned where?
	22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, subject to our preserving	22	A. During the course of this litigation that were previously
	23	the rights to object to the admissibility of any of this opinion	23	unavailable to us.
	24	testimony, we certainly do not challenge Dr. Palmer's	24	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for
1			10:02:49 25	
10:00:20	25	credentials.	10:02:49 23	identification Exhibit 190.

	1446		1448
1	BY MR. GINGOLD:	1	A. Yes, I prepared this to show the different time periods and
2	Q. Exhibit 190 is identified as Attachment A, corrected	2	different ways that disbursements and revenues were calculated
3	revenues compared with Dr. Scheuren's estimated collections.	3	or used to establish the numbers for inputs into the model.
4	Dr. Palmer, did you prepare this exhibit?	4	Q. And will this help explain with some clarity precisely how
10:03:11 5	A. I did.	10:06:32 5	you performed the calculations in your model?
6	Q. Could you explain to the Court what it is?	6	A. It's helpful, at least for me, to see when we had reported
7	A. Yes. What I did was I took from the output of	7	evidence, when we had when we estimated for the missing data,
8	Dr. Scheuren's model his estimated collections, and then I	8	and when we had adjusted other information that were available
9	graphed it or plotted it to compare against the attachment of	9	to us.
10:03:29 10	corrected revenues so I could compare they had gone about a	10:06:51 10	Q. You identify in the first column on the left period
11	different procedure to get to their numbers, so I wanted to	11	identifier. Correct?
12	compare to see what they looked like after we finished with	12	A. Correct. The period identifier there was again just as an
13	ours.	13	easy way, these are the periods were identified only by the
14	Q. And what is the red line on the graph?	14	change of information, and for example, you'll see here for the
10:03:40 15	A. The red line would be Dr. Scheuren's estimated collection	10:07:08 15	revenues, periods six, seven, and eight, we had the same basic
16	numbers.	16	information and methodology used, it's just that in 1945 there
17	Q. And the black line, what is that?	17	was no disbursement information. So that's why there was a
18	A. The other line would be the revenues that are found in	18	break in there. But these periods were to identify the
19	Attachment A.	19	different ways that the revenues and disbursement information
10:03:51 20	Q. Generally speaking, do you have any assessment with regard	10:07:28 20	was used.
21	to what is reflected in this chart?	21	Q. And what is the first period that you've identified?
22	A. That the revenues were quite similar.	22	A. The first period there is 1987 to excuse me, 1887 to
23	Q. Are there differences?	23	1908. During the period during the first period there was no
24	A. Yes, there are.	24	information available, so we had used the estimate procedure, as
10:04:08 25	Q. What are they?	10:07:51 25	described by Dr. Cornell, a straight line interpolation. Based
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1447		1449
1	A. Well, for example, Dr. Scheuren did not use the \$121 million	1	upon the information from 1909 and starting with a balance of
2	receipt revenue number in 1968 that, when presented to him	2	zero.
3	during his cross-examination, he said he should have used that	3	Q. And what does the second period reflect?
4	number, that would cause his numbers to be higher, I believe,	4	A. The second period we have reported information from
10:04:27 5	during that period.	10:08:08 5	documentary evidence, and so we used that for that time period.
6	Also, there were some adjustments that we made to the	6	And then the third period is, again we didn't have information
7	data in terms of exclusion of interest and the inclusion of the	7	there, so estimates were provided through using a straight line
8	entire Osage annuity, that adjustments were not made by	8	interpolation between the information we had reported and the
9	Dr. Scheuren.	9	following period.
10:04:42 10	Q. Let's go back to Plaintiffs' 189-A, which is Attachment A,	10:08:29 10	Q. When you state you didn't have information, was any
11	analysis of benefit to the government. Dr. Palmer, I would like	11	information provided by defendants in the course of this
12	to focus on the revenue or the flow of funds into the Trust	12	proceeding?
13	aspect of this attachment. Could you generally explain what the	13	\ensuremath{A} . Not for that time period. The time periods where estimates
14	columns refer to in the revenue component of this model?	14	are listed in this column were neither plaintiffs nor defendants
10:05:13 15	A. The revenue, the corrected revenue, which is the ultimate	10:08:47 15	had any information during that period. When defendants did
16	revenue that we used, is comprised of estimated revenues, also	16	provide additional information, we used that information as
17	an adjustment to the Osage annuity. The revenue column, which	17	well.
18	is Column B labeled here, we took available information that we	18	Q. Could you please explain period number four?
19	received, sometimes had to adjust it, but we have that that's	19	A. Period number four, the 1915 to 1920, the defendants did not
10:05:41 20	what's included here. Sometimes there were missing information	10:09:05 20	use this information but we had found documentary evidence in
21	and we also had to estimate for missing values.	21	the course of the litigation. It was Dr. Angel had mentioned
22	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for	22	that we had previously used both allotted and unallotted lands
23	identification Exhibit 188.	23	and he felt it was inappropriate to use the unallotted lands.
24	BY MR. GINGOLD:	24	So we did change our numbers there where we took out the
10:06:00 25		10:09:26 25	unallotted lands and only included revenues for the allotted
10.00.00	Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize this exhibit? Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	10.09.26 20	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net

³ of ³⁹ sheets PDF created with pdfFactory trial version <u>www.pdffactory.com</u>

	1450		1452
1	lands. That would cause the estimates between 1912 and 1914	1	an appropriate level would be. There was as I recall, there
2	also to change because they were interpolated. So if we change	2	was a comment that was made in the January 30th decision by the
3	one end of the information used, the interpolated values would	3	Court, and went and found the document that related to that, and
4	change as well.	4	there it talked about collections were a fraction or that the
10:09:42 5	Q. So in the original model, was the unallotted income included	10:13:17 5	monies that went into the Trust were a fraction of the total
6	in the data?	6	collections, and there's a number that they used of around
7		7	77 percent.
8	A. It was. It was included, but again, because of the	8	•
9	testimony during the course of litigation, we took it out. Q. With regard to period identifier number six?	9	So I used that number to adjust up the revenues. Once
10:10:06 10		10:13:33 10	I did that, then I looked at the disbursement ratio, just as
10:10:06 10	A. Period identifier number six, there were Morgan Angel data	10:13:33 10 11	kind of a sanity check, to see if the number was what we had
12	that were provided, again during the course of the litigation,	12	observed elsewhere, and it seemed to be in line. So, the best
	that we did not have available to us when we prepared		information we had and that's what we used.
13	Attachment A for Dr. Cornell. It says "adjusted" here, because	13	MR. GINGOLD: Antonio, could you please put on the
14	also in the litigation Dr. Angel, I believe, testified and there	14	screen Defendant's 365? If we can focus in on the footnote,
10:10:27 15	was also a footnote in Ms. Herman's backup material that said	10:13:58 15	please.
16	that the revenues during this period were understated. So we	16	BY MR. GINGOLD:
17	adjusted the revenues upward during this period.	17	Q. Dr. Palmer, the last two lines of the footnote reference
18	MR. GINGOLD: Let's call up Defendant's Exhibit 372,	18	estimated credits. Do you see that?
19	please. If we can go to page 10. If you can focus in on the	19	A. I do.
10:11:03 20	highlighted footnote, please.	10:14:17 20	Q. Have you read this before?
21	BY MR. GINGOLD:	21	A. Yes. This is indeed where we got the 77 percent that we
22	Q. Doctor, have you seen this footnote before?	22	used as an adjustment factor for the Morgan Angel data.
23	A. Yes, I have. This is what I was referring to.	23	Q. Thank you.
24	Q. This is what you were referring to with respect to what?	24	MR. GINGOLD: Let's go back to Plaintiffs' 188.
10:11:17 25	A. That here she had said that because the information that was	10:14:37 25	BY MR. GINGOLD:
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1451		1453
1	1451 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it	1	Q. With respect to period seven?
1		1 2	
	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it		Q. With respect to period seven?
2	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not	2	Q. With respect to period seven?A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure,
2	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information	23	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then,
2 3 4	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the	2 3 4	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so
2 3 4 10:11:42 5	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be	2 3 4 10:14:55 5	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated.	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before.
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote?	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point.	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please?	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data.
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD:	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13	used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17	Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year.
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18 19	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. Q. Thank you. Now, you say what is identified in this 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel have treated it?
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18 19 10:12:36 20	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. Q. Thank you. Now, you say what is identified in this column is adjusted MA. Correct? 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18 19 10:15:54 20	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel have treated it? A. I treated it exactly the way Dr. Scheuren did. So anyway,
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18 19 10:12:36 20 21	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. Q. Thank you. Now, you say what is identified in this column is adjusted MA. Correct? A. That is correct. 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18 19 10:15:54 20 21	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel have treated it? A. I treated it exactly the way Dr. Scheuren did. So anyway, that takes us back to 1955. The next data point that we had
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18 19 10:12:36 20 21 22	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. Q. Thank you. Now, you say what is identified in this column is adjusted MA. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And what exactly is adjusted MA? 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18 19 10:15:54 20 21 22	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel have treated it? A. I treated it exactly the way Dr. Scheuren did. So anyway, that takes us back to 1955. The next data point that we had from reported information was in 1968. The defendants did not
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18 19 10:12:36 20 21 22 23	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. Q. Thank you. Now, you say what is identified in this column is adjusted MA. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And what exactly is adjusted MA? A. Again, we used the information that was the data reported by Dr. Angel, and then because it was understated, the question 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18 19 10:15:54 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel have treated it? A. I treated it exactly the way Dr. Scheuren did. So anyway, that takes us back to 1955. The next data point that we had from reported information was in 1968. The defendants did not use 1968. Dr. Angel was asked about it and had said he was unware of it or didn't use it, at least, and then came back the
2 3 4 10:11:42 5 6 7 8 9 10:11:54 10 11 12 13 14 10:12:15 15 16 17 18 19 10:12:36 20 21 22 23 24	 used by Dr. Angel were reports that did not include as it says, the proceeds did not include any sources that were not paid into the General Treasury Account, so that the information was incomplete, and it would understate receipts. And the testimony during the trial was that the receipts would be understated. Q. Did you review the legislation that was referenced in this footnote? A. I believe I did look at it at some point. MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification the 1906 statute, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Dr. Angel sorry, Dr. Palmer, if you can focus in on the highlighted section of this statute. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. Is this a statute that you just testified to that you've read related to the footnote? A. That's correct. Q. Thank you. Now, you say what is identified in this column is adjusted MA. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. And what exactly is adjusted MA? A. Again, we used the information that was the data reported by 	2 3 4 10:14:55 5 6 7 8 9 10:15:22 10 11 12 13 14 10:15:40 15 16 17 18 19 10:15:54 20 21 22 23	 Q. With respect to period seven? A. Well, periods six through eight, we used the same procedure, where we took the Morgan Angel data and adjusted it. Then, after we used that, the next data point we had was in 1955, so we used linear interpolation between 1950 to '54 time period to estimate those. The '55 data point would have been identical to what we had before. In this litigation we learned about the 1923 to 1949 data, so our estimates during that period of '50 to '54 for the missing data would be different because the estimation procedure is using different data. Also, I guess I do want to point out for 1922, is an estimate, that Dr. Angel did provide data for 1922. It was substantially different than the rest of the data. Dr. Scheuren called it an outlier and disregarded it in his analysis, and I believe Dr. Angel also said it was unusual as well. So we treated that as a missing data year. Q. So did you treat that the same as Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Angel have treated it? A. I treated it exactly the way Dr. Scheuren did. So anyway, that takes us back to 1955. The next data point that we had from reported information was in 1968. The defendants did not use 1968. Dr. Angel was asked about it and had said he was

Page 1450 to 1453 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1454			1456
1	run rate, or an average of several years.		1	Q. And then from 1996 to 2007, you've stated you used qualified
2	So arguably we could have put that amount of, I think		2	audit data. Correct?
3	it was \$121 million for several years, but we were conservative		3	A. That is correct.
4			4	
_	and only used it for 1968, and then estimated, again the linear	40-00-40	_	MR. GINGOLD: Let's go back to Attachment A, which is
10:16:43 5	interpolation, for the missing data between those two points.	10:20:10	6	Plaintiffs' 189-A, please.
7	One other distinction that is different from the data		7	BY MR. GINGOLD:
_	here from what we used before, is that all of because of the		-	Q. So in the discussion of revenues and how you calculated
8	model, we take out interest that was included kind of in the		8	them, where is that reflected on Attachment A?
9	inflows, and before we did not have any information about		9	A. Well, the discussion we just had would be the Column B that
10:17:03 10	interest in 1968 or interest in other years, we don't have an	10:20:27		talks about all the different adjustments that were made to the
11	interest breakout for the information during the year, so we		11	individual years for new information.
12	used the Morgan Angel data. So we estimated an implicit		12	Q. At any point in time when you reviewed documents and you
13	interest amount to take out.		13	found revenue data in those documents, did you use that data?
14	So we've actually, in comparing the new Attachment A		14	A. We tried to use as much reported information as was
10:17:21 15	versus the earlier one, although some of the data points	10:20:49		available for the IIM Trust as a whole. So for example, the
16	themselves haven't changed, the numbers would be lower because		16	1915 period that we talked about a little earlier, we used that
17	we've taken interest out. We don't know what it would be, so		17	information, the defendants did not. We used it because we
18	what we did is estimate it based upon the balances that were		18	added up some areas that we thought would be for example,
19	provided by I think Dr. Angel, and estimated what the entire		19	grazing and timber, mineral rights, other things like that to
10:17:40 20	amount of interest would be using a 10-year Treasury bond rate,	10:21:14	20	try to get up at a number, so we tried to use that as an
21	and subtracted that out.		21	estimate.
22	Q. And why did you subtract it out, Dr. Palmer?		22	Q. Were there documents that reported revenue information and
23	A. Again, because of the way the model works, the model looks		23	disbursement information where you didn't use disbursement
24	at inflows without interest so that it can calculate what the		24	information?
10:18:00 25	totals would be in terms of benefit, and then subtracts out at	10:21:29	25	A. Not that I'm aware of.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net			Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1455			1457
1	the bottom any interest or other things that would have accrued		1	Q. Was there any issue in 1955 in that regard?
2	because it's sitting in the balance of the Trust.		2	A. For 1955 the disbursement information we did adjust, and we
3	The next period after the information that we had in		3	can talk about that now or we can talk about it later when we
4	1968, we have data starting in 1972 provided by the defendants.		4	talk about disbursements.
10:18:19 5	So again, there's an estimation that's done between 1969 and	10:21:50	5	Q. We'll talk about it later. I'm just asking whether or not
6	1971. Those years were estimated by linear interpolation again.		6	you used the information?
7	Q. With regard to 1972 to 1987?		7	A. The information was used.
8	A. 1972 to 1995, for revenues we used information from		8	Q. Let's go to page two of Attachment A. In all these periods
9	that's provided on AR-171, and then subsequently in the years		9	that we've identified and you've discussed in your period
10:18:48 10	1996 to 2007, we used the qualified audit report information.	10:22:06	10	identifiers, is the information in Column B the calculation that
11	Q. Is the information you used from 1972 to 1995 the same or		11	you made based on what you just explained to the Court?
12	different from the information the government has used?		12	A. That is correct.
13	A. Well, it was the information the government used in		13	Q. And that's on page two, page three well, throughout
14	October. It's different from the information that the		14	Column B, revenues, the information that is contained in these
10:19:13 15	government used in the trial that is currently proceeding. I	10:22:40	15	revenues through 2007, how does that relate to the discussion or
16	believe it was DX-371 was the exhibit that Michelle Herman used		16	explanation you've just provided to the Court?
17	that had different information for those years.		17	A. Again, we just walked through the document that describes
18	Q. And why didn't you use that information?		18	each of the individual ways that we obtained the revenue and
19	A. The information the new information that Michelle Herman		19	used the information that is put into the Attachment A,
10:19:32 20	had used had been reduced from the earlier years on her	10:22:57	20	Column B.
21	cross-examination. As I recall, she wasn't able to identify		21	Q. And that relates directly to the periods or the years that
22	what that information was or why she had done a procedure, but		22	you identified. Correct?
23	was really unable to identify why the information had changed.		23	A. 1887 through 2007.
24	There was also some other concerns with some of the underlying		24	Q. Was there any change in your total revenue calculation as a
10:19:55 25	data, so he used the earlier data.	10:23:10		result of the modifications you made?
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		-	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
L		· · ·		

Page 1454 to 1457 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1458		1460
1	A. Yes, there was.	1	government that they had claimed that the tribal amount of the
2	Q. What was the result?	2	Osage headright was one-and-a-quarter percent.
3	A. The total went down, I'm trying to remember the exact	3	Q. Doctor, did you yourself review that brief?
4	number, but the total went down because of the new data and	4	A. I did.
10:23:25 5	information we had received that we utilized.	10:26:24 5	MR. GINGOLD: Could you please mark for identification
6	Q. Let's talk about the next column, which is Column C in	6	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 183?
7	Plaintiffs' 189.	7	BY MR. GINGOLD:
8	THE COURT: We don't have any of this on our screen. I	8	Q. Dr. Palmer, do you recognize what is identified as
9	don't think the witness	9	Defendant's motion to dismiss?
10:23:42 10	MR. GINGOLD: We're getting it.	10:26:43 10	A. Yes, I do.
11	BY MR. GINGOLD:	11	Q. What is it?
12	Q. Let's talk generally about a couple of the issues that we	12	A. This is the source of the information for the
13	have in Attachment A. Attachment A, Column C is identified as	13	one-and-a-quarter percent. This is the defendant's motion,
14	"Osage Government Calculated." Could you please provide the	14	United States of America, and the date on this is in 2001.
10:24:02 15	Court with a general discussion of what that means.	10:27:02 15	Q. I would like to turn to page 39 of this brief, please.
16	A. Consistent with what we had done before, the Osage	16	MR. GINGOLD: If we can focus in on the highlighted
17	government calculated information is taken the government's	17	section at the bottom of the page.
18	estimate of how much of the Osage annuity went into the IIM	18	BY MR. GINGOLD:
19	Trust.	19	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace$. The statement in the brief is, there is one exception to the
10:24:24 20	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ Is there a difference between the government's calculation	10:27:19 20	last statement. The tribe itself is also a headright owner, in
21	and yours?	21	fact, approximately one-and-a-quarter headright.
22	A. Between I'm sorry?	22	Is that the information you relied on to make the
23	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace.$ Is there a difference between the government's calculation	23	adjustment with regard to your Osage data?
24	of the annuity that went into the IIM Trust from your	24	${\bf A}_{{\bf c}}$ Yes. We reduced the amount of the annuity that would have
10:24:36 25	calculation of the flow of funds?	10:27:39 25	been going to the individual IIM by the one-and-a-quarter
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1459		1461
1	A. That is correct. The government estimated there's a	1	percent.
2	couple of different things. The government estimated the amount	2	Q. Did you apply that one-and-a-quarter percent throughout the
3	of the annuity that they believed was had gone into the	3	history of the IIM Trust?
4	Trust. That estimate was also based upon headright a	4 10:27:57 5	A. Yes, for every year from 1887 through 2007 we reduced the
10:24:55 5	constant number of headright shares, 2,229. Dr. Angel had	10:27:57 5	annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent.
7	testified that the number of headright shares before 1906, I	7	 Q. And why did you do that? A. It was the best available information we had, so we used it
8	believe, were different, and that the in fact, at the beginning his estimate was it was around 1,500, and that in 1906	8	for all time.
9	I believe it was around 2,100.	9	Q. Do you know whether or not the tribe had a one-and-a-quarter
10:25:20 10	So we adjusted accordingly to make based upon his	10:28:10 10	headright at any time prior to the date of this brief?
11	testimony, we tried to adjust the total value of the Osage	11	A. I do not. I believe that I read something that the original
12	annuity based on those number of shares. And then also we then	12	annuity was set up for individual members, so I would imagine
13	took out what the government's estimate was of revenues, so	13	that at the time it was set up the tribe had zero headright.
14		14	But this is the best available information, so we used it for
	subtracted it out, and then took the total value of the annuity.		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, _,, _
10:25:43	subtracted it out, and then took the total value of the annuity. So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding	10:28:33 15	all time.
10:25:43 15 16	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding	10:28:33 15 16	all time. Q. And let's go back to Attachment A. please.
10:25:43 15 16 17			Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please.
16	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in.	16	
16 17	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by	16 17	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to
16 17 18	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent based upon information that there	16 17 18	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to interrupt your Q&A here, but this might be an opportune time to
16 17 18 19	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent based upon information that there was an earlier case that one-and-a-quarter percent was actually	16 17 18 19	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to interrupt your Q&A here, but this might be an opportune time to have at least a brief discussion of a motion that was filed last
16 17 18 19 10:26:00 20	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent based upon information that there was an earlier case that one-and-a-quarter percent was actually going to the tribe, so it was not available to the individual	16 17 18 19 10:28:58 20	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to interrupt your Q&A here, but this might be an opportune time to have at least a brief discussion of a motion that was filed last week, as you undoubtedly know and as the government knows, by
16 17 18 19 10:26:00 20 21	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent based upon information that there was an earlier case that one-and-a-quarter percent was actually going to the tribe, so it was not available to the individual Indians.	16 17 18 19 10:28:58 20 21	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to interrupt your Q&A here, but this might be an opportune time to have at least a brief discussion of a motion that was filed last week, as you undoubtedly know and as the government knows, by the Osage to intervene. Do the plaintiffs have a position on
16 17 18 19 10:26:00 20 21 22	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent based upon information that there was an earlier case that one-and-a-quarter percent was actually going to the tribe, so it was not available to the individual Indians. Q. Was that information presented by defendants in this	16 17 18 19 10:28:58 20 21 22	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to interrupt your Q&A here, but this might be an opportune time to have at least a brief discussion of a motion that was filed last week, as you undoubtedly know and as the government knows, by the Osage to intervene. Do the plaintiffs have a position on that motion, and if so, are you prepared to articulate it?
16 17 18 19 10:26:00 20 21 22 23	So add that back in. So it was kind of taking out and adding in. We also adjusted the total value of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent based upon information that there was an earlier case that one-and-a-quarter percent was actually going to the tribe, so it was not available to the individual Indians. Q. Was that information presented by defendants in this proceeding?	16 17 18 19 10:28:58 20 21 22 23	Q. And let's go back to Attachment A, please. THE COURT: Mr. Gingold, this might be I'm sorry to interrupt your Q&A here, but this might be an opportune time to have at least a brief discussion of a motion that was filed last week, as you undoubtedly know and as the government knows, by the Osage to intervene. Do the plaintiffs have a position on that motion, and if so, are you prepared to articulate it? MR. GINGOLD: If you give me about 10 seconds, Your

Page 1458 to 1461 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1462		1464
1	THE COURT: Anybody here representing the Osage?	1	To the extent the tribe is seeking damages, and it is
2	MR. GODFREY: Yes, Your Honor. Merrill Godfrey from	2	within whatever the rules are in the Court of Claims, for itself
3	Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, on behalf of the Osage	3	or, if possible, the individuals and Your Honor, we
4	Nation.	4	understand there's a lot of controversy in that regard that
10:30:00 5	(OFF THE RECORD.)	10:33:38 5	we're not involved in or for the action brought by the tribe
6	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, as I stated, we have not	6	in this court that was filed several years after the class was
7	focused on that because we've been preparing the litigation. We	7	certified, we think whatever claims the tribe has have been
8	have informed the Osage tribe that we oppose, and we oppose for	8	independently litigated, they do not involve the claims in this
9	several reasons, one of which is that the proceeds from the	9	litigation, and to the extent they do involve the claims in this
10:30:21 10	mineral estate are identified by statute as the funds of the	10:34:00 10	litigation, the class certification order trumps the effort made
11	individual Osage Indians.	11	by the Osage tribe.
12	Secondly, the Mineral Council for the Osage tribe	12	So, Your Honor, it is our position that since we're not
13	itself has identified in a resolution that the litigation that	13	seeking damages in this proceeding, the tribe is seeking damages
14	it has brought, and there are two separate actions, Your Honor,	14	in the Claims Court, the tribe is seeking damages for whatever
10:30:43 15	one in this court and one in the United States Court of Federal	10:34:20 15	its interest is, as I understand it, in this court, and filed
16	Claims, is for the benefit of the individual headright owners.	16	several years after we filed our case, it is very well protected
17	That is consistent, Your Honor, with the statute itself, which	17	and there's no need for it to intervene in this proceeding.
18	identified all the proceeds of the mineral estate as the rights	18	And it's as simple as that, Your Honor, and we believe
19	and property of the individual headright owners.	19	it's a question of law as stated in the governing statute, and
10:31:05 20	Our class was certified on February 4th, 1997, for all	10:34:41 20	as the government itself represented to the U.S. Court of Claims
21	past and present Individual Indian Trust beneficiaries, and it	21	in the brief that was just referenced by Dr. Palmer.
22	has been interpreted by this Court as for funds held in Trust.	22	THE COURT: Mr. Quinn, do you want to be heard?
23	It is plaintiffs' position that the funds have been	23	MR. QUINN: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. Michael Quinn
24	continuously held in trust, that those funds are the	24	for the United States.
10:31:27 25	individuals', and that the right, title, and interest in those	10:34:58 25	We had anticipated responding in writing to this, but I
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1463		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 1465
1		1	
1	1463	1	1465
	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in	_	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the
2	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself.	2	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have
2 3	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an	2 3	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a
2 3 4	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool	2 3 4	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by
2 3 4 10:31:50	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the	2 3 4 10:35:19 5	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene.
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust.	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law.	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury.
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury.	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 12 13 14 10:32:32 15 16	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard.	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15 16 17	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interests of the tribe are protected if the one-and-a-quarter interest is	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16 17	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15 16 17 18	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interests of the tribe are protected if the one-and-a-quarter interest is deducted from whatever is discussed here, and the interest	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16 17 18 19	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a class, and Mr. Gingold likes to talk about it, but the
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15 16 17 18 19	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interests of the tribe are protected if the one-and-a-quarter interest is	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16 17 18	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10 12 13 14 10 32:32 15 16 17 18 19 10:32:59 20	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interest is deducted from whatever is discussed here, and the interest issue, to the extent it applies, is not included in this	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16 17 18 19 10:36:24 20	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a class, and Mr. Gingold likes to talk about it, but the definition is clearly stated in the February 4, 1997 order, and
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15 16 17 18 19 10:32:59 20 21	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interest is deducted from whatever is discussed here, and the interest issue, to the extent it applies, is not included in this litigation. And Your Honor, we brought this action not for	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16 17 18 19 10:36:24 20 21	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a class, and Mr. Gingold likes to talk about it, but the definition is clearly stated in the February 4, 1997 order, and it isn't exactly as Mr. Gingold articulates it.
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10 12 13 14 10 12 13 14 10 12 13 14 10 12 13 14 10 11 12 13 14 10 11 12 13 14 10 11 12 13 14 10 11 12 13 14 10 11 12 13 14 10 11 11 12 13 14 10 11 11 12 13 14 10 11 11 12 13 14 10 11 11 12 13 14 10 11 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 12 14 12 13 14 12 14 12 12 14 12 13 14 12 14 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 13 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interests of the tribe are protected if the one-and-a-quarter interest is deducted from whatever is discussed here, and the interest issue, to the extent it applies, is not included in this litigation. And Your Honor, we brought this action not for purposes of damages litigation, as we've stated from the	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10 3 5:58 15 16 17 18 19 10:36:24 20 21 22	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a class, and Mr. Gingold likes to talk about it, but the definition is clearly stated in the February 4, 1997 order, and it isn't exactly as Mr. Gingold articulates it. If we could put it up on the screen. The definition is
2 3 4 10:31:50 5 6 7 8 9 10:32:11 10 11 12 13 14 10:32:32 15 16 17 18 19 10:32:59 20 21 22 23	1463 funds in a beneficial way is in the members of the tribe, not in the tribe itself. There is, as was testified to by Dr. Palmer, an acknowledged one-and-a-quarter interest in that particular pool of funds. Those funds are held at the Treasury, and the Treasury itself disburses those funds. It is in a different ALC, but they are still individual Indian funds held in trust. It's characterized as an annuity, Your Honor, but in fact it's not an annuity as that is defined as a matter of law. But it is a fund; all right, title, and interest is to the beneficiaries, the individuals themselves, and not to the tribe. But the tribe does, Your Honor, as a result of the legislation, have a right to a percentage of the interest earned on that pool for the 3 months that it's held in the Treasury. That plus the one-and-a-quarter interest, to the best of our knowledge, is the only right that the tribe has in that regard. Consequently, Your Honor, we believe the interests of the tribe are protected if the one-and-a-quarter interest is deducted from whatever is discussed here, and the interest issue, to the extent it applies, is not included in this litigation. And Your Honor, we brought this action not for purposes of damages litigation, as we've stated from the beginning and repeated frequently in this proceeding. The	2 3 4 10:35:19 5 6 7 8 9 10:35:43 10 11 12 13 14 10:35:58 15 16 17 18 19 10:36:24 20 21 22 23	1465 can address the United States's position with respect to the motion to intervene by the Osage Nation. Frankly, we don't have any objection to the Osage Nation intervening for the purpose, a narrow purpose, which would need to be specifically stated by the Court, with respect to the Tribal interests that the Osage Nation expresses concern about in their motion to intervene. At page three of their brief they express concern about an argument by plaintiffs that the Osage mineral estate income is at all times the vested property interest of individual Osage headright owners. And they go on to say that according to the plaintiffs, when the United States collects Osage mineral royalties and deposits them, it, quote, collects the trust funds of Osage headright owners and deposits them into the Treasury. The Osage Nation, to the extent it has responsibilities over the mineral assets and initial collection of funds for later disbursement to headright owners, may have a collective organizational and entity interest with respect to the monies at that period of time. Plaintiffs in this case have certified a class, and Mr. Gingold likes to talk about it, but the definition is clearly stated in the February 4, 1997 order, and it isn't exactly as Mr. Gingold articulates it. If we could put it up on the screen. The definition is actually a class of present and former beneficiaries of

Page 1462 to 1465 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1466		1468
1	beneficiary, an individual has had an Individual Indian Money	1	papers amicus curiae, and I said no, we don't do amicus curiae
2	account, there's no possibility that they could be in this	2	in this case. But I sort of invited the intervention for the
3	class, regardless of whether they receive other monies,	3	limited purpose for which they have moved for leave to
4	including tribal monies that are paid out of the Tribal Trust.	4	intervene.
10:37:02 5	The Osage headright interests for the most part are	10:40:43 5	Intervention, at least permissive intervention, is, I
6	paid to individuals and disbursed directly out of the Tribal	6	think, liberally granted in a case in which a party asserts an
7	Trust. That has been the historical experience. Monies	7	interest, and I will grant the motion of the Osage Nation to
8	disbursed in that fashion that never enter into the IIM system	8	intervene. I'll call it permissive intervention. I do not
9	in the first place are not even part of this case, regardless of	9	anticipate that the Osage Nation will take any active part in
10:37:21 10	what plaintiffs argue here and do so in effect in their model	10:41:10 10	the examination of witnesses or the presentation of evidence,
11	that we're taking examination on today.	11	but they certainly will be heard at the briefing stage when they
12	The only plaintiffs in the class and the only aspect of	12	want to be heard on the question of exactly how Osage money
13	the Osage annuity that's at issue before the Court are the	13	should be treated.
14	amounts, the fractions of headright payments that are paid into	14	So the motion is granted for the limited purpose
10:37:44 15	the IIM system for deposit into individual accounts. Those are	10:41:32 15	asserted in the motion for leave to intervene. And this may be
16	primarily people who are minors at the time of receipt, or	16	an appropriate time, since I've already interrupted the
17	incompetents who have a guardianship relationship, and the money	17	testimony, to take a brief recess so we can handle the two brief
18	is deposited into the account for their benefit.	18	criminal matters that we have. We'll be in recess, I think it
19	The tribe, however, may have a collective interest in	19	will take us about 15 minutes.
10:38:04 20	certain early aspects of the money flow, but once it is	11:08:22 20	(Recess taken at 10:41 a.m.)
21	disbursed to individuals, those are individual interests. The	21	THE COURT: All right, Mr. Gingold. Proceed. Thank
22	individuals who are not in this class, that is, all the people	22	you.
23	who received direct payments who have never had an IIM account,	23	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.
24	have no standing in this class, they're not even part of the	24	BY MR. GINGOLD:
10:38:22 25	plaintiff group, they can't be represented by the plaintiffs'	11:08:29 25	Q. Dr. Palmer, prior to the break you were discussing in
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	() <u></u>		
	1467		1469
1	1467	1	1469 Attachment A. analysis of benefit to the government
	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented	-	Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government
1 2 3	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation.	1 2 3	Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's
2	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the	2	Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government
2 3 4	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a	2 3 4	Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD:
2 3 4 10:38:41 5	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney	2	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns?
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in	2 3 4 11:08:52 5	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct.
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment?
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct.
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers?
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation.	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity.
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals.	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17 18	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel?
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18 19 10:39:49 20	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in interrupting the direct examination of Dr. Palmer, and you both	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17 18 19	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel? A. During his testimony he provided that information, and
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18 19 10:39:49 20 21	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in interrupting the direct examination of Dr. Palmer, and you both	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17 18 19 11:09:50 20	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel? A. During his testimony he provided that information, and that's the basis for that adjustment.
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18 19 10:39:49 20 21 22	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in interrupting the direct examination of Dr. Palmer, and you both responded on the fly with interesting and complex arguments that I'm frank to say I'm not sure I entirely follow at this point.	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17 18 19 11:09:50 20 21	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel? A. During his testimony he provided that information, and that's the basis for that adjustment. Q. Did you make any corrections as a result of Ms. Herman's
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18 19 10:39:49 20 21 22 23	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in interrupting the direct examination of Dr. Palmer, and you both responded on the fly with interesting and complex arguments that I'm frank to say I'm not sure I entirely follow at this point.	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17 18 19 11:09:50 20 21 22	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel? A. During his testimony he provided that information, and that's the basis for that adjustment. Q. Did you make any corrections as a result of Ms. Herman's testimony?
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18 19 10:39:49 20 21 22 23 24	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in interrupting the direct examination of Dr. Palmer, and you both responded on the fly with interesting and complex arguments that i'm frank to say I'm not sure I entirely follow at this point. But I think I need to I think we need to deal with the motion to intervene of the Osage Nation just for the record.	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11:09:50 20 21 22 23 24	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel? A. During his testimony he provided that information, and that's the basis for that adjustment. Q. Did you make any corrections as a result of Ms. Herman's testimony? A. There were changes to what we had used here and what we had
2 3 4 10:38:41 5 6 7 8 9 10:39:04 10 11 12 13 14 10:39:30 15 16 17 18 19 10:39:49 20 21 22 23	counsel here. Also, we would submit they cannot be represented by the Osage Nation. In another case and forgive me, I don't have the cite here. We can provide it to the Court later today. In a March decision by the Court of Federal Claims, where an attorney representing individual headright owners sought to intervene in an Osage litigation involving the United States, the Osage opposed that intervention but opposed the attorney because he had previously represented the tribe. And the Court went into some extended discussion about the different interests that individual headright owners hold vis-a-vis the Osage Nation. So with respect to anything that the Osage Nation would wish to assert on behalf of headright owners who are receiving money who are not in the class, we would our position is that they are not in a position to represent or speak for those individuals, but they may have a limited role in protecting the interest of the tribe overall, in terms of the early stages of the revenue generation before disbursement to individuals. THE COURT: All right. Well, I certainly succeeded in interrupting the direct examination of Dr. Palmer, and you both responded on the fly with interesting and complex arguments that I'm frank to say I'm not sure I entirely follow at this point.	2 3 4 11:08:52 5 6 7 8 9 11:09:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:09:34 15 16 17 18 19 11:09:50 20 21 22 23	 Attachment A, analysis of benefit to the government MR. GINGOLD: If we can put Attachment A back up. It's 189-A. Thank you, Antonio. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. The Osage government calculated Osage corrected columns? A. That's correct. Q. These columns are C and D of your attachment? A. That is correct. Q. Just briefly, could you please restate what you identified as what you corrected with regard to the Osage revenue numbers? A. There were two corrections. The one correction that we had just talked about before the break was a reduction of the annuity by one-and-a-quarter percent for the tribal headright share. Also a correction we had made was to adjust for the early years this would be 1887 to 1906 for a different number of headright shares. Again, we're trying to calculate the value of the total annuity. Q. Was that calculation based on information provided by Dr. Angel? A. During his testimony he provided that information, and that's the basis for that adjustment. Q. Did you make any corrections as a result of Ms. Herman's testimony?

	1470		1472
1	changed her estimate of how much of the Osage was actually in	1	with that?
2	the IIM Trust.	2	A. I'm familiar somewhat with it, yes.
3	Q. As a result of your calculations, what occurred with regard	3	Q. What is your understanding of that issue?
4	to your totaling the Osage revenue?	4	A. The defendants identified a separate amount of IIM Tribal
11:10:25 5	A. I'm not sure I understand.	11:13:44 5	monies. We looked at the IIM Tribal monies, and something we'll
6	Q. Did the revenues go up or down?	6	talk about soon, I believe, is disbursement information, and the
7	A. Oh, the revenues would have gone down.	7	checks and the electronic fund transfers were all the
8	Q. Let's turn to page four of this exhibit.	8	information that were identified as going out of the account, so
9	MR. GINGOLD: If we can focus in on the total column on	9	we included all of that.
11:10:48 10	page four of Attachment A, "Analysis of Benefit to Government."	11:14:06 10	Also, as I understand, there are at least the tribal
11.10.46	BY MR. GINGOLD:	11	
12	Q. Do you see the totals under "Osage Corrected"?	12	monies were not supposed to be in the IIM Trust at this point,
12	A. I do.	12	and in the calculation at the very end we subtract out
14		14	everything that's in the Trust so that it was really not an issue in our calculation.
14 11:11:09 15	Q. Is that the total that you've just testified went down as a	14 11:14:23 15	
	result of your calculations?		Q. Were you able to identify Tribal IIM money in any of the
16	A. That's a nominal total, and I believe it's lower. I don't	16	documents that you reviewed?
17	remember the exact number of the earlier, but I believe it's	17	A. What I recall from the documents I reviewed said that often
18	lower.	18	the Tribal monies were combined with the individual monies, and
19	Q. With regard while we're focusing on this total column on	19	it couldn't exactly be identified. The government did provide
11:11:23 20	page four, if we can look at the revenues under Column B,	11:14:46 20	an estimate of what they thought were Tribal monies. I believe
21	please.	21	Dr. Angel had provided a number to Ms. Herman of 10 to
22	A. Yes.	22	15 percent for different years. That was his understanding, and
23	Q. With regard to those revenues, are they also stated in	23	upon I believe cross-examination some documents were pointed out
24	nominal terms?	24	of much smaller percentages, one or two percent as I recall, so
11:11:36 25	A. They are.	11:15:05 25	that there wasn't really information, precise information that
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1471		1473
1	1471 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements.	1	14/3 we could examine in that regard.
2		1 2	
	Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements.		we could examine in that regard.
2	Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements.A. Okay.	2	we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for
2 3 4 11:12:12 5	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' 	2 3	we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83.
234	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement 	2 3 4	we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD:
2 3 4 11:12:12 5	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5	we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6	we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th,
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83.
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? 	2 3 4 11:15:25 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before?
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13 14	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have.
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language?
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13 14	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 13 14 11:12:53 15 16	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an 	2 3 4 11:15:25 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:55 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17 18	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. Q. And with respect to the available data, when you sat through 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:56 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17 18 19	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source documents.
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:13:11 20	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. Q. And with respect to the available data, when you sat through this proceeding for the last two weeks or so, is that where you 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17 18 19 11:16:28 20	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions tould not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source documents.
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:13:11 20 21	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. Q. And with respect to the available data, when you sat through this proceeding for the last two weeks or so, is that where you gathered a lot of your new information? 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17 18 19 11:16:28 20 21	we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: 4. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A. Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source documents. So essentially they weren't able to distinguish the two.
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:13:11 20 21 22	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. Q. And with respect to the available data, when you sat through this proceeding for the last two weeks or so, is that where you gathered a lot of your new information? A. That's correct. There is new information that we received 	2 3 4 11:15:25 6 7 8 9 11:15:26 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17 18 19 11:16:28 20 21 22	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: 4 Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source documents. B os essentially they weren't able to distinguish the two. Q. So that confirms your understanding of the testimony
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:13:11 20 21 22 23	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. MR. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. Q. And with respect to the available data, when you sat through this proceeding for the last two weeks or so, is that where you gathered a lot of your new information? A. That's correct. There is new information that we received that we cived that we didn't previously have. 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:16:13 15 16 17 18 19 11:16:28 20 21 22 23	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source documents. B So that confirms your understanding of the testimony there was testimony but no documents presented?
2 3 4 11:12:12 5 6 7 8 9 11:12:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:12:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:13:11 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. I would like to now talk to you about disbursements. A. Okay. M.R. GINGOLD: If we could go to page one of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 189. If we can please focus on the disbursement columns. That's the last five columns on this page, please. BY M.R. GINGOLD: Q. Were you asked to calculate disbursements as well? A. Yes, we did. Q. And generally, before you go into detail, what did you do with regard to the calculation of disbursements? A. The calculation of disbursements changed from what we had previously used. Again we had additional information that we received, and so we incorporated that information. Previously we had taken an average over the entire time period and used that average throughout. Here we tried to incorporate any reported information we had, again, sometimes subject to an adjustment, but we tried to use as much available data as possible. Q. And with respect to the available data, when you sat through this proceeding for the last two weeks or so, is that where you gathered a lot of your new information? A. That's correct. There is new information that we received that we didn't previously have. Q. Now, one of the items that is related may be related to 	2 3 4 11:15:25 5 6 7 8 9 11:15:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 we could examine in that regard. MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for identification Exhibit 83. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Exhibit 83 is GAO testimony dealing with Indian Trust funds Tribal account balances. This is dated Thursday, February 7th, 2002, and it is stated it is reported as a statement of McCoy Williams, acting director, Financial Management and Assurance. Plaintiffs would like to turn to page six of PX-83. Dr. Palmer, I would like you to focus on the highlighted section of this report. Have you read this before? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is your understanding of this highlighted language? A Well, in the middle it says, due to missing records and the lack of an audit trail throughout IRMS, Tribal transactions could not be efficiently isolated from the individual transactions, and therefore, because of this, Tribal IIM accounts maintained in IRMS were not reconciled to source documents. B So essentially they weren't able to distinguish the two. Q. So that confirms your understanding of the testimony there was testimony but no documents presented? MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection. Leading.

Page 1470 to 1473 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1474		1476
1	Q. Sorry. Were there documents presented during the testimony	1	Q. So did you use the same reported data that Dr. Angel used?
2	of Dr. Angel?	2	A. I believe so.
3	A. From what I remember from Dr. Angel's testimony is that he	3	Q. With respect to 1923 to 1944, what does MA signify in the
4	was not able to identify precisely his feeling of what those	4	disbursements column?
11:16:58 5	percentages were, but since we didn't have really precise	11:20:15 5	A. Again, that's the Morgan Angel data. Morgan Angel data were
6	information, we did not make any separate distinction.	6	provided for 1923 to 1949. They happened to have one year
7	Q. Were you able to verify any of the estimates of Dr. Angel?	7	missing of 1945, so we supplied, consistent with what we had
8	A. No.	8	done in other areas, that missing data with an average from the
9	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to have Exhibit 188	9	documentary evidence that we had.
11:17:18 10	back on the screen, please. I would like to isolate the	11:20:37 10	Q. You don't identify this as adjusted, do you?
11	disbursement section of Plaintiffs' 188.	11.20.37	A. In terms of the Morgan Angel data, we did not adjust it,
12	BY MR. GINGOLD:	12	that's correct.
13	Q. Dr. Palmer, did you prepare the disbursement column in this	13	Q. 1945, what issue is associated with 1945?
14	exhibit?	14	 A. 1945 was a period during the Morgan Angel data that they did
11:17:46 15	A. Yes, I did.	11:20:57 15	not have any disbursement information, so we estimated that
16	Q. Okay. Could you please explain what the disbursement column	16	missing year.
17	means, beginning with the periods in question?	17	Q. And 1946 to 1949 you have MA as well. Correct?
18	A. Well, again, there were several periods for which	18	A. That's correct.
10		10	Q. And does that mean that you used the same data that
11:18:04 20	information was missing, and for the missing information for	11:21:12 20	Worgan Angel used?
11:18:04 20 21	the periods of missing information we used what reported	11:21:12 20 21	A. That is correct.
22	documentary evidence we had and adjusted and used an average	22	Q. For 1950 to 1954?
23	rate for the periods surrounding that time frame. There's one	23	A. During that period, again, we took an average of it's
23	period early that we relied on the 1909 to 1911 documents,	24	
11:18:26 25	there's also a later time period that we had the CP&R and EFT	11:21:30 25	somewhat between the earlier period, 1909 and 1911, and the later period, which was 1988 to 2002. So we took the average
11:18:26	data so we could identify and examine precisely what went out of Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>	11:21:30 20	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1475		1477
1	the Trust. And so we used that average for a later time period.	1	rate of those two and averaged it.
2	And then there were some time periods in between where we took	2	Q. With respect to 1955?
3	an average of those two.	3	A. 1955 we had some information we had information, both
4	So that was what we did for the missing information	4	the same information that defendants were using. In looking at
11:18:43 5	periods. Also we had some disbursement information that was	11:21:54 5	that information there was that particular document in 1955,
6	provided by Dr. Angel that we previously didn't have. We	6	there was a lot of concern raised in the document about
7	utilized that. And then for some of the periods we did an	7	disbursements not having been documented, not having an audit
8	adjustment to the information that defendants had provided for	8	trail. There was just an awful lot of concern about the
9	disbursements.	9	disbursements during that time, so we had adjusted the
11:19:00 10	Q. Let's start with period one, 1887 to 1908.	11:22:13 10	disbursement number there based upon information that we had
11	A. Okay. That was a period where there was no information	11	calculated in Attachment C.
12	available. Also from the 1912 to 1922 period, there was no	12	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for
13	information available. So we took from 1909 to 1911, we had	13	identification Exhibit 53. If you can focus in a little more
14	documentary evidence and used those reported numbers for the	14	clearly, please.
11:19:24 15	time periods around then.	11:22:44 15	BY MR. GINGOLD:
16	Q. With respect to 1909 to 1911, you identified documents?	16	Q. Plaintiffs' Exhibit 53 is an audit report to the Congress of
17	A. That's correct.	17	the United States, Administration of Individual Monies by Bureau
18	Q. What does that mean?	18	of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, November 1955. And
19	A. There's some annual reports that we looked at that reported	19	this is by the comptroller general of the United States.
11:19:39 20	at the time what the receipts into the Trust and disbursements	11:23:01 20	I would like to turn your attention to page eight of
21	for individual monies were.	21	this exhibit. I would like to focus on the left-hand side of
22	Q. Do you know whether those are the same documents that	22	the page, the last paragraph, if we can, where it begins:
23	Dr. Angel relied on?	23	Following is a summary of deficiencies.
24	A. Yes. The 1909 to 1911 numbers are the same that both the	24	Have you read this document before?
		1	-
11:19:56 25	government and we are using.	11:23:37 25	A. Yes, I have.
11:19:56 25		11:23:37 25	A. Yes, I have. Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>

Page 1474 to 1477 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1478		1480
1	Q. Is the information that's identified on this page and if	1	ratio for pretty bad?
2	we can go to the next page when you're finished reviewing	2	THE WITNESS: No, I'm sorry, we only have one ratio.
3	that the information that led you to be concerned about the	3	THE COURT: All right. I can't wait.
4	disbursement data?	4	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.
11:23:57 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection. Leading.	11:27:14 5	BY MR. GINGOLD:
6	THE COURT: I'll allow it.	6	Q. With respect to 1969 to 1971, back to Plaintiffs' 188.
7	A. As I mentioned, there was a document that I had identified	7	A. 1969 to 1971, actually, from 1956 to 1971 there were no
8	that I had seen that discussed concerns at the time about the	8	disbursement information available to us that we could find, and
9	disbursement data and issues with the disbursement data, so we	9	also the defendants didn't have any, so we used there the
11:24:14 10	had adjusted that year, the information for that year that was	11:27:41 10	average rate for a time period later, when we had both the $\ensuremath{CP\&R}$
11	reported.	11	and the EFT information, so checks and electronic fund
12	MR. GINGOLD: So for purposes of making sure the record	12	transfers, that we could identify exactly what was leaving the
13	is clear, we have this as page eight of the exhibit, but it was	13	Trust. We used the average rate for that time period for the
14	actually page 10 and page 11 of the document itself.	14	1956 to 1971 period.
11:24:47 15	Plaintiffs would also like to mark for identification	11:27:59 15	Q. What did you do for 1972 to 1987?
16	Exhibit 181. This is identified as an audit report to Congress	16	A. For 1972 to 1987, again we did an adjustment, and that
17	of the United States, Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the fiscal	17	adjustment, it's the same ratio we just talked about, that when
18	years ended June 30, 1952 and 1953, by the comptroller general	18	we get to Schedule C and talk about how it was calculated,
19	of the United States.	19	you'll see that's the adjustment we used for that period. Also
11:25:14 20	BY MR. GINGOLD:	11:28:23 20	the period after, the time period we had the information, the
21	Q. I would like you to turn your attention to page 19 of this	21	2003 to 2007, we do have a ratio adjustment there, and that's
22	document or page 12 of this document, please. This is	22	based upon the time period 1988 to 2002, when we had the actual
23	identified on page 19 of the original document itself, but it's	23	check data and the electronic transfer data.
24	page 12 of our exhibit.	24	MR. GINGOLD: Let's go to Schedule C, which is
11:25:32 25	Have you read this before?	11:28:46 25	PX-189-C.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1479		1481
4	• · · · ·		
1	A. I believe so.	1	BY MR. GINGOLD:
2	Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and	2	Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer?
2 3	Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements?		Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer?A. Yes.
2 3 4	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the 	2 3 4	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is.
2 3 4 11:25:49 5	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the HIM Trust
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "completely inadequate" and so 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 11 12	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be.
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be.
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15	Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data?	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little core up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17 18	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify: THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is this? 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17 18	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use that average for time periods when we don't have information.
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little cole up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is this? THE WITNESS: We will get to that. In Schedule C we 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use that average for time periods when we don't have information.
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17 18 19 11:26:42 20	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little coluct regarding the deplorable conditions", completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is this? THE WITNESS: We will get to that. In Schedule C we actually estimate an amount of adjustments, and from information 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17 18 19 11:30:07 20	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use that average for time periods when we don't have information.
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17 18 19 11:26:42 20 21	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is this? THE WITNESS: We will get to that. In Schedule C we actually estimate an amount of adjustments, and from information we actually have in terms of checks and EFTs for a time period 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17 18 19 11:30:07 20 21	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the 11M Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use that average for time periods when we don't have information. Also, this document was used to examine what the defendants had reported as their disbursements and their rate of disbursement during this same time period, and then that's how
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17 18 19 11:26:42 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "little color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is this? THE WITNESS: We will get to that. In Schedule C we actually estimate an amount of adjustments, and from information we actually have in terms of checks and EFTs for a time period where we can look at what actually was disbursed from the Trust, 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17 18 19 11:30:07 20 21 22	Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the IIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use that average for time periods when we don't have information. Also, this document was used to examine what the defendants had reported as their disbursements and their rate of disbursement during this same time period, and then that's how we calculated the average adjustment rate, because in some years
2 3 4 11:25:49 5 6 7 8 9 11:26:09 10 11 12 13 14 11:26:32 15 16 17 18 19 11:26:42 20 21 22 23	 Q. Could you please tell me whether or not you've read this and what effect it had on your calculation of disbursements? A. Well, again, this expresses concern at the time about the handling of disbursements and the information that was available, so therefore, as it says, there's weaknesses and deficiencies, is when we looked at the reported information, we adjusted for, in 1955, we adjusted that year, this being close to it. THE COURT: But how did you use I mean, these are words like "deplorable conditions", "little concern regarding the deplorable conditions", "completely inadequate" and so forth. I mean, did you use words like this to come up with any quantitative adjustment, or did this just color your view of the data? THE WITNESS: I can't quantify THE COURT: Is this a 15 percent discount, or what is this? THE WITNESS: We will get to that. In Schedule C we actually estimate an amount of adjustments, and from information we actually have in terms of checks and EFTs for a time period where we can look at what actually was disbursed from the Trust, and then we can compare that with other reported information at 	2 3 4 11:29:06 5 6 7 8 9 11:29:07 10 11 12 13 14 11:29:46 15 16 17 18 19 11:30:07 20 21 22 23	 Q. Did you prepare Attachment C, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. Please explain what it is. A. Well, there's a couple of different things that happened in this attachment. Basically what we're doing is we're trying to look at actual information that we have, or at least we understand is the actual information. The CP&R captures the checks that were actually written, the EFT or the electronic funds transfers and both of these are out of the HIM Trust and we used those to look at what the total disbursements out of the Trust would be. We compared that to the corrected revenue numbers for those years, and that gave us an average disbursement rate. We then, since we had this actual information for those years, 1988 to 2002, we used the actual disbursement rates in our calculation. We then take an average of those years and use that average for time periods when we don't have information. Also, this document was used to examine what the defendants had reported as their disbursements and their rate of disbursement during this same time period, and then that's how we calculated the average adjustment rate, because in some years

Page 1478 to 1481 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1482		1484
1		1	vhich was this was an example of what was previously done.
2	and EFT information, the CP&R and EFT information, that it seemed to us logically that that same type of overreporting	2	MR. GINGOLD: Could we please go to footnote seven,
3	would be in those other years as well. So that's why we did a	3	which is on the next page?
4	ratio adjustment.	4	BY MR. GINGOLD:
11:30:46 5	The adjustment that we do use here is different from	11:33:50 5	Q. Dr. Palmer, did you draft this footnote?
6	the one that was previously done. The one that was previously	6	A. It was drafted under my direction.
7	done that Dr. Cornell talked about in Attachment C was using an	7	Q. Please explain it.
8	average used number of checks, and I believe, as the Court	8	A. What we were doing here was taking information that we had
9	pointed out, and we have a little box down there, that the	9	on DX-272 236, DX-236, which had the total amount that was
11:31:06 10	average number of checks paid were higher than the average	11:34:15 10	paid out in checks for the given year.
11	number of checks that were written, being so they were kind	11	Q. Total amount paid out in checks from what source?
12	of, the residual or unpaid checks were lower.	12	A. The source was on DX-236. It was the government data that
13	So what we did for this instead is we used a total	13	they had provided to us.
14	amount, so a dollar amount, which would be essentially a dollar	14	Q. Okay. Proceed.
11:31:25 15	weighted average. But the total dollar checks that were paid	11:34:33 15	A. Okay. And from that then we also we knew the number of
16	versus the total dollar checks that were written, we see that's	16	checks that had been cashed, and so we divided those two numbers
17	93.68 percent. So in the years where we didn't have that	10	to get the value of checks cashed. We knew from the CP&R data
18	information in terms of the checks that were paid, we	18	the number of checks that were issued and the total value of
19	adjusted that's the difference between Column B and	19	checks issued. Dividing the total checks issued divided by the
11:31:43 20	Column C we adjusted the checks that were written by this	11:34:59 20	checks that were issued gave us an average check value.
11.31.43 20 21	percentage of checks that were cashed, as it were, to get at an	11.34.39 20 21	So then we created those two. The amount of money that
22	adjusted number.	22	was not cashed that was issued gave us the amount of money
23	We then added to that adjusted number the electronic	23	you're holding up your hand.
24	funds transfers. This was again information that we had	24	Q. Let's go to DX-272.
11:32:02 25	received during the course of this litigation that we lidu't	11:35:20 25	A. Okay.
11.52.02	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net	11.33.20 20	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1483		1485
	1400		1405
1	proviously have. The defendants provided to us the BACEP	1	O Have you reviewed this exhibit before?
1	previously have. The defendants provided to us the PACER	1	Q. Have you reviewed this exhibit before?
2	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number	1 2 3	A. Yes, I have.
2	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust	2	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention.
2 3 4	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds	234	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before?
2 3 4 11:32:20 5	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds	2 3 4 11:36:08 5	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data.
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it?
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account,
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year,	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records.
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time?
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002.
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time?
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before?
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed.
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell,	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16 17	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16 17	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16 17 18	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16 17 18 19	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I was planning to do that.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the \$175,544,960.19.
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16 17 18 19 11:33:15 20	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I was planning to do that. THE COURT: Good. Thank you.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:37:21 20	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the \$175,544,960.19. Q. Did you utilize that data in Attachment C?
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 10 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 12 13 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 11 11 12 13 12 11 12 13 12 11 11 12 13 12 11 12 13 12 11 12 13 12 11 12 13 12 11 12 13 12 12 12 12 12 12 11 12 12 12 12 12 12	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I was planning to do that. THE COURT: Good. Thank you.	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:37:21 20 21	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the \$175,544,960.19. Q. Did you utilize that data in Attachment C? A. Yes, we did. That is the information that we were able to
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16 17 18 19 11:33:15 20 21 22	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I was planning to do that. THE COURT: Good. Thank you. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. First, when you were you were talking about average	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 3 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 11 12 12 11 12 12 11 12 12 11 12 12	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the \$175,544,960.19. Q. Did you utilize that data in Attachment C? A. Yes, we did. That is the information that we were able to utilize to get at the fraction of the amount that was cashed
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11:32:50 15 16 17 18 19 11:33:15 20 21 22 23	database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I was planning to do that. THE COURT: Good. Thank you. BY MR. GINGOLD: 9. First, when you were you were talking about average checks. Correct?	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:53 15 16 17 18 19 11:37:21 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the \$175,544,960.19. Q. Did you utilize that data in Attachment C? A. Yes, we did. That is the information that we were able to utilize to get at the fraction of the amount that was cashed versus the amount that was written. That's the 93 percent.
2 3 4 11:32:20 5 6 7 8 9 11:32:35 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 11 12 12 13 14 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 database so we could go in and add up and calculate the number of electronic funds that were transferred out of IIM Trust accounts, so we can add the checks to the electronic funds transfers, which we were told were the only way that funds really go out of the IIM Trust, and that gave us the total disbursement. That total disbursement then, divided by the revenues in any given year, give us a disbursement rate for that year, and it varies over time. And then that's how we got the average. And then as I mentioned earlier, we calculated a ratio that defendants' documents had used for disbursement numbers for other years. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Gingold, I'm sure that answer was complete, comprehensive, and understandable to you. But it's a textbook example of why narrative answers don't sell, because I need for you to go over that line by line, calculation by calculation if I'm going to have any idea what he just said. MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I was planning to do that. THE COURT: Good. Thank you. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. First, when you were you were talking about average checks. Correct? A. verage checks, so we're talking now about the blue box down 	2 3 4 11:36:08 5 6 7 8 9 11:36:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 11 11 12 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 14 11 12 12 12 14 11 12 12 12 11 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	 A. Yes, I have. Q. On page 48 of DX-272, I would like to direct your attention. Have you seen this information before? A. Yes, I have. This is the information that we were able to obtain that we obtained for the CP&R data. Q. And what does that reflect as you understand it? A. These are the checks that were issued out of the account, the IIM Trust account, the amount and the number of records. Q. Is it limited to any particular period of time? A. Well, we have information here annually from 1987 to 2002. Q. Let's now turn to Defendant's 236, DX-236. Have you seen this document before? A. Yes. This is the the second page of this document actually gives the dollar number of the checks that were cashed. It's reflected on the first page, but here we have it all the way out to the cents, whereas the first page it was rounded to less digits. And the number we used you'll see for 1999 is the \$175,544,960.19. Q. Did you utilize that data in Attachment C? A. Yes, we did. That is the information that we were able to utilize to get at the fraction of the amount that was cashed versus the amount that was used to illustrate and to

Page 1482 to 1485 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1486		1488
1	MR. GINGOLD: I would like to back go to DX-272,	1	A. It's the PACER database, and that went from the years 1998
2	please. I would like to go to page 50.	2	to 2002. Before 1998 there was not information available for
3	BY MR. GINGOLD:	3	that fiscal year, so what we did was to we had a separate
4	Q. Now, you've seen this before. Have you seen this before?	4	report from NORC that they had prepared in examining the EFTs
11:38:20 5	A. Yes, I have.	11:41:38 5	earlier, and said there were a they gave a number of
6	Q. Did you utilize this information at all?	6	transactions from before the PACER database information we have.
7	A. Yes. This is the source that gives us, in the table down	7	So we took the average number of EFT per transaction in
8	below, of the number of checks.	8	1998, multiplied it by the number of transactions that the NORC
9	Q. Let's focus in on the table below. What is reflected in	9	document indicated, and then had a three-year decay so we could
11:38:34 10	this table, as you understand it?	11:42:05 10	smooth that out over time.
11	A. Again, I believe it's called "R," as we saw the code above,	11	Q. Were there any other data sources that you reviewed other
12	for 1999 gives us the number of checks that were cashed. And we	12	than PACER, the NORC document, and the CP&R database?
13	used that information in conjunction with the dollar amount that	13	A. Those were the foundation for the information here.
14	we just looked at, to get at the average value for checks	14	Q. Just for clarity, could you just explain to me how you
11:38:54 15	cashed.	11:42:27 15	calculated the average check value?
16	Q. Did you adjust this information that is contained in this	16	A. The average check value was, take the total amount of
17	table?	17	checks, divide it by the number of checks, and that gives an
18	A. I don't believe so.	18	average check value. And then there are different categories
19	Q. Let's go to page 51 of this exhibit. Have you seen this	19	that we looked at. So we looked at checks that were written,
11:39:15 20	table before?	11:42:53 20	checks that were paid, and then other checks that were not paid.
21	A. Yes.	21	Q. The not-paid checks, how did you calculate that amount?
22	Q. What is it, as you understand it?	22	A. That would be the difference dollar-wise between what was
23	A. Again, the same type of information. There's two CDs that	23	written and what was paid. That would be the dollar other, and
24	were provided, so it's combining the two tables together to	24	then the number would be the number of checks that were written
11:39:26 25	create the total number.	11:43:13 25	versus the number of checks that were cashed. And that would be
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1487		1489
1	Q. Now, does this explain how you used the CP&R data?	1	the number of checks other. And then dividing those two gave
2	A. This shows that for the last two tables we just looked at	2	the average other.
3	were used in terms of the number of checks, in order to	3	Q. Did you eliminate any checks that were identified in the
4	calculate the per check value. The numbers we looked at earlier	4	database for any reason whatsoever?
11:39:52 5	in terms of the dollar numbers, that's what we used for the CP&R	11:43:27 5	A. We used all the information that were available.
6	data that's reflected in Attachment C.	6	Q. So you didn't review whether or not the checks were paid to
7	Q. Did you rely on any other information other than the	7	Trust beneficiaries. Correct?
8	information in DX-272 for that calculation?	8	A. We used any and all checks that came out of the IIM Trust.
9	A. For the calculations in Schedule C, that was the source of	9	It was the code that was identified and to whom it went we
11:40:11 10	our information.	11:43:49 10	don't have the checks, we don't know where it went, but we took
11	MR. GINGOLD: Let's go back to Schedule C, please.	11	all the information for checks that were paid out, and the same
12	BY MR. GINGOLD:	12	with the electronic funds transfers.
13	Q. I would like you to focus your attention on Column D, which	13	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace.$ And did you use all that information as a disbursement from
14	is EFT.	14	the Trust?
11:40:33 15	A. Okay.	11:44:00 15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. What exactly does the EFT data mean?	16	Q. What did you do with regard to EFT in that regard?
17	A. EFT are electronic funds transfers. Again, in the previous	17	A. Again, all of the electronic funds transfers that came out
18	version of Attachment C that Dr. Cornell testified to, we did	18	of the accounts that we had, we used all of those to come out.
19	not have the EFT information. That's been subsequently provided	19	So with regards to whom it went, the information we have is if
11:40:54 20	to us, so we looked at that. We had data actually for 1988	11:44:21 20	it leaves the Trust, then we're counting it as a disbursement.
21	through 2002 of the funds that were transferred out of the IIM	21	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to mark for
22	Trust electronically as opposed to by check. So the	22	identification Plaintiff Exhibit AR-388.
23	disbursements are the two, the checks and the EFTs.	23	BY MR. GINGOLD:
24	Q. Do you recall which database you relied on for that	24	Q. Dr. Palmer, this document is identified as electronic
11:41:16 25	information?	11:44:45 25	payment prototype for the Alaska region. It is a NORC document
12 of 20 sh	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>	1490 of 152	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net 06/25/2008_01:02:06 04/25/2008_01:02:06 04/25/2008_01:02:06

	1490			1492
1	dated September 30th, 2003. Have you reviewed this document?		1	going specifically out of the Trust.
2	A. Yes, this is a document that was the source of the number		2	BY MR. GINGOLD:
3	that I had just mentioned about the number of electronic funds		3	Q. And with respect to Column F, corrected revenues, what is
4	transfers before the PACER database information.		4	that?
11:45:09 5	MR. GINGOLD: Can we turn to page nine, please? If we	11:48:18	5	A. Column F are the numbers from Attachment A that we have just
6	could focus on the highlighted paragraph at the bottom of the		6	looked at and we talked about earlier. So we have those
7	page.		7	revenue numbers are brought in here, they're identical. Then we
8	BY MR. GINGOLD:		8	take the division between the information in Column E and Column
9	Q. Have you reviewed this before?		9	F, and that gives us a disbursement rate. So the ratio of those
11:45:23 10	A. Yes, this is the number, this 669 are the number of	11:48:39	10	two.
11	electronic payments in the IRMS that were posted before October	1	11	Q. With regard to 1988, you have a disbursement rate column.
12	of 1997. The PACER data system begins, at least the information	1	12	There is no percentage there. Why is that?
13	we were provided begins in October of 1997, so we wanted to	1	13	A. That's a good question. I don't know. There should be.
14	include an estimate of what the electronic payments were before	1	14	Q. In any event, how would you calculate the disbursement rate?
11:45:43 15	the time period, and that's when we used the average of the	11:49:04	15	A. It would be the ratio of the information in Column E to
16	earliest time that was available, and multiplied it by the 669,	1	16	Column F.
17	and then spread that over time.	1	17	Q. With regard to Column AR-171 "disbursement rate, one percent
18	Q. Were you able to identify any other information to be able	1	18	of receipts," what is that?
19	to include in your calculations for CP&R disbursements or EFT	1	19	A. I'm sorry, what was that again?
11:46:04 20	disbursements?	11:49:19	20	Q. What is supposed to be in Column H, AR-171, "disbursement
21	A. This is all the information we had available to us.	2	21	rate, one percent of receipts"?
22	Q. I would like to go back to Attachment C, please. The	2	22	THE COURT: It doesn't say "one percent;" it just says
23	information that's identified in the columns that you prepared,	2	23	"percent."
24	let's take 1988, for example. CP&R disbursements unadjusted,	2	24	MR. GINGOLD: Sorry, I misread it, Your Honor.
11:46:32 25	what is that?	11:49:36	25	THE COURT: Okay.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>			Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1491			1493
1	A. That is the information that we received of the total amount		1	A. What we did there is we took the disbursement information
2	that was written, or checks written out of the account for the		2	and the revenue information from AR-171, and we divided the two
3	IIM Trust.		3	to get a disbursement rate that would be reported in AR-171.
4	Q. Now, you have Column C, which is CP&R disbursements		4	And that then, on the year-by-year comparison, would be able to
11:46:53 5	adjusted. What does that mean?	11:49:53	5	be seen to be what is the rate that's reported there versus what
6	A. What we did is we looked when we had information, which we		6 	is the rate that we observed looking at what was actually
7	had just reviewed, for a year, 1999, where we were able to see		7	disbursed through checks and EFTs.
8	that the total dollar amount of checks that were cashed, we took		8	BY MR. GINGOLD:
9	the ratio of the checks that were cashed to the total amount of		9	Q. Now let's look at so we have a completed year, let's drop
11:47:11 10 11	checks, and that gave us a 93.68 percentage.	11:50:10	10 11	to 1989 and the disbursement rate column. A. Yes.
12	So we adjusted the other years that all the amounts of checks that were written were not all cashed. So the adjusted		11 12	A. Yes.Q. There is a rate identified under the disbursement rate
12	column reflects that adjustment.		12 13	column. What is it?
14	Q. And the CP&R and EFT disbursement column, what is that?		14	A. 74.5.
11:47:31 15	With respect to 1988.	11:50:22		Q. And how did you calculate that?
16	A. So for 1988 we do not have		16	 A. And that's calculated, the ratio of Column E to Column F.
17	THE COURT: Excuse me, Dr. Palmer. Every number in		17	So the total amount that was disbursed from checks and EFTs,
18	Column C is 93.68 percent of the numbers in Column B?		18	divided by the revenues for that year, gave the 74.5.
19	THE WITNESS: That's exactly correct.		19	Q. And under Column H for 1989?
11:47:48 20	THE COURT: All right.	11:50:46		A. So Column H, the number there is taken from taking the
21	A. And then Column D we've just talked about are the electronic		21	disbursements for 1989, divided by the revenues for 1989 found
22	funds transfer information we have. Column E then is the sum of		22	in AR-171, and that gave the 108.3 percent.
23	the adjusted CP&R amount and the EFT amount.	2	23	Q. And now under the disbursement adjustment ratio percent of
24	So if we add those two columns together, that should be	2	24	actual disbursements under Column I, what is that number?
11:48:07 25	the total amount of disbursements that have been identified	11:51:14	25	A. So what we've done there is take the amount that was the
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>			Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>

06/25/2008 01:02:06 PM PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1494		1496
1	disbursement rate in AR-171, which is the 108.3, and divided	1	out, then it's true that the disbursement rate would change.
2	that by the 74.5, which is the disbursement rate that we	2	But again, we have information that not all checks that went out
3	calculate based upon the information we have going out of the	3	were actually cashed, so and we have an average number there
4	Trust, the checks and EFTs, and we see that the disbursement	4	as an illustration.
11:51:39 5	rate on AR-171 was 45.4 percent higher.	11:54:52 5	But it does affect
6		6	THE COURT: And Mr. Gingold, do the parties all agree
7	THE COURT: What do you do with that number?	7	
8	THE WITNESS: What we do with that number is we do that	8	that the float, basically the float, which is uncashed checks,
9	for each year, then we come down to the bottom and get an	9	constitutes money that should be returned to all the IIM account holders?
11:51:59 10	average of all those years, so on average those numbers are	11:55:10 10	
11:51:59 10	34 percent higher.		MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I can't speak for the
12	THE COURT: Yeah.	11	government. It's plaintiffs' position that if the money was to
	THE WITNESS: Then what we do is take that back to the	12	be paid out by check and it wasn't, it's Trust money that
13	years where we don't have specific check and EFT information.	13	remained in the Trust.
14	So for example, in 1985, 1985 we don't have information on what	14	THE COURT: It's paid out but never cashed.
11:52:12 15	the checks were and what the EFTs were. But we do have a number	11:55:22 15	MR. GINGOLD: Well, it's never been paid out. The
16	from Ms. Herman of what her disbursements were. So we look and	16	check wasn't negotiated. If you write a check to yourself and
17	we see when we can identify, when we have all the information,	17	put it in your desk drawer, your account balance shouldn't
18	that on average those numbers are 34 percent higher, so we	18	change. The difference is, Your Honor, when a check is cut on
19	adjust in the years when we don't have the specific information,	19	the 14X-6039 account, immediately the account is debited without
11:52:33 20	we adjust her numbers down. And that's when we were talking	11:55:41 20	regard to when the check is cashed or not.
21	about earlier, that you had asked to see what the ratio	21	THE COURT: So I suppose the question devolves into two
22	adjustment was. That's the ratio we adjust things by.	22	subquestions. The first is, in your theory of the case, the
23	So, for example, again, the disbursement number that we	23	government is required to disgorge all the float to IIM members.
24	have for 1985 we take from AR-171.	24	Right?
11:52:52 25	THE COURT: Well, I don't understand why you need	11:56:03 25	MR. GINGOLD: If that's what you would like to
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1495		1497
1	1495 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent	1	1497 characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have
1		1	
	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent	-	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have
2	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing?	2	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not
23	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent	2	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay?
2 3 4	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years	234	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes.
2 3 4 11:53:09 5	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all.	2 3 4 11:56:11 5	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171,	2 3 4 11:56:11 5	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right?
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor.
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all.
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34.	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor.
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what Dr. Palmer was talking about.
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what Dr. Palmer was talking about. Can we bring up Plaintiffs' 191, please?
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15 16	134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what Dr. Palmer was talking about. Can we bring up Plaintiffs' 191, please? BY MR. GINGOLD:
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15 16 17	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what Dr. Palmer was talking about. Can we bring up Plaintiffs' 191, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q . Have you seen this before, Dr. Palmer?
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15 16 17 18	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17 18	<pre>characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not</pre>
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15 16 17 18 19 11:54:12 20	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. THE COURT: All right. Now, this disbursement rate that you've got in Column G is powerfully driven by this average check calculation that you've done, isn't it? 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not</pre>
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15 16 17 18 19	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. THE COURT: All right. Now, this disbursement rate that you've got in Column G is powerfully driven by this average 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17 18 19 11:56:53 20	<pre>characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not</pre>
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11:53:49 15 16 17 18 19 11:54:12 20 21 22	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. THE COURT: All right. Now, this disbursement rate that you've got in Column G is powerfully driven by this average check calculation that you've done, isn't it? THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say powerfully. It does have an effect. So if the average so if, for example, we just 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17 18 19 11:56:53 20 21	<pre>characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not</pre>
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 5 16 17 18 19 11:54:12 20 21 22 23	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. THE COURT: All right. Now, this disbursement rate that you've got in Column G is powerfully driven by this average check calculation that you've done, isn't it? THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say powerfully. It does have an effect. So if the average so if, for example, we just took, instead of using an adjusted number, it was 94 percent, 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17 18 19 11:56:53 20 21 22	<pre>characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not</pre>
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 11:54:12 20 21 22 23 24	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. THE COURT: All right. Now, this disbursement rate that you've got in Column G is powerfully driven by this average check calculation that you've done, isn't it? THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say powerfully. It does have an effect. So if the average so if, for example, we just took, instead of using an adjusted number, it was 94 percent, approximately, 93.6 percent, if we used 100 percent so that 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 5 16 17 18 19 11:56:53 20 21 22 23 24	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what Dr. Palmer was talking about. Can we bring up Plaintiffs' 191, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you seen this before, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. What is this? A. This is an example of taking a specific year and showing how the adjustment would be, based upon the information in Attachment C, we had just talked about roughly this. And here it lists the number in AR-171 for disbursements for 1987 is 258.4 million. Based upon our adjustment factor, that again we
2 3 4 11:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 11:53:25 10 11 12 13 14 11 12 13 14 11 5 16 17 18 19 11:54:12 20 21 22 23	 134.1 percent. Aren't you really just using the 74.45 percent number? Isn't that essentially the same thing? THE WITNESS: No, they're different. The 74 percent number is the average disbursement rate. We use that for years when we don't have any information at all. When we have actual information, as reported in AR-171, they're going to bounce up and down. On average it would probably be the same, but we wanted to look at, instead of just taking a straight percentage, we wanted to allow year-to-year variation. But that year-to-year variation, when we observed the information for both years, that information was higher, so we adjusted down by dividing by 1.34. So again, 1985, whatever was in AR-171, we divided that number down to adjust it, and then we can use that number, but just adjusted down to a level that was consistent when we had information from the actual checks and actual electronic funds transfer. THE COURT: All right. Now, this disbursement rate that you've got in Column G is powerfully driven by this average check calculation that you've done, isn't it? THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say powerfully. It does have an effect. So if the average so if, for example, we just took, instead of using an adjusted number, it was 94 percent, 	2 3 4 11:56:11 5 6 7 8 9 11:56:27 10 11 12 13 14 11:56:45 15 16 17 18 19 11:56:53 20 21 22 23	characterize it, Your Honor, yes. But they are funds that have not THE COURT: But the answer is yes. Okay? MR. GINGOLD: Yes. THE COURT: And the next question is, you also want a benefit of the government calculation based on that, because you assert that the money was wrongfully withheld. Right? MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. Or withheld. Whether it was wrongful or not is not the issue, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Just want to orient myself in your argument, that's all. MR. GINGOLD: Be my guest, Your Honor. Maybe it would help if we had an example of what Dr. Palmer was talking about. Can we bring up Plaintiffs' 191, please? BY MR. GINGOLD: A. Have you seen this before, Dr. Palmer? A. Yes. Q. What is this? A. This is an example of taking a specific year and showing how the adjustment would be, based upon the information in Attachment C, we had just talked about roughly this. And here it lists the number in AR-171 for disbursements for 1987 is

Page 1494 to 1497 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1498		1500
1	was cashed, went out in terms of checks and also electronic	1	problems, Your Honor. We'll go back to this document.
2	funds transfer, and there we look at, the total there would be	2	BY MR. GINGOLD:
3	adjusted to 192.62 million.	3	Q. Do these documents refresh your recollection about anything?
4	Q. And what does that adjusted number mean?	4	A. Well, the next page of the document actually talks about
11:57:38 5	A. The adjusted number is then what we used in our calculation	12:02:35 5	specific areas of disbursements, and one of the items it talks
6	as the outflows in that year.	6	about for disbursements were investments in Liberty Loan bonds
7	Q. Okay. Let's go to AR-171. Let's go to	7	and war stamps, and they were listed as disbursements.
8	MR. GINGOLD: Can we focus on 1987, please?	8	Q. Now, why did you take note of that?
9	BY MR. GINGOLD:	9	A. Well, investment in Liberty Loan bonds and purchasing war
11:58:11 10	Q. Do you see the number that you just discussed?	12:02:56 10	stamps, it's an investment. It's an asset. And so it may have
11		12.02.56	
12	 A. Yes, it's in the far right-hand column, the 258.4 million. So that's the source of the information in the example that was 	12	been a disbursement of funds out of an account to purchase those, but it's still within the IIM Trust. It's still an
		12	
13 14	just put up.	14	asset, it's still an investment.
	Q. Did you prepare this document?		And so noticing that in some years disbursements were
11:58:24 15	A. AR-171, I did not. I prepared the example that we just	12:03:14 15	called lots of different things, gave me some concern, and I
16	showed, but I did not prepare 171.	16	think that's one of the reasons that we looked at this ratio for
17	Q. Do you know whose document this is?	17	time periods when we did have information.
18	A. AR-171 is a government document.	18	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this is PX-92, and this is
19	Q. Thank you. I would like to return to Attachment A, please.	19	the page we didn't have before.
11:58:49 20	And again I would like to focus on the disbursement component of	12:03:35 20	BY MR. GINGOLD:
21	Attachment A.	21	Q. This page in highlight, what does it say, Doctor?
22	Have you reviewed government documents regarding	22	A. The highlighted area says disbursements.
23	disbursements items identified as disbursements from the	23	Q. And then let's go on to the next page, please. And let's
24	Individual Indian Trust?	24	focus in on the last paragraph.
11:59:27 25	A. Yes, I have.	12:03:52 25	A. Again, so this is under the categories of disbursements, it
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1499		1501
1		1	
1 2	1499	1	1501
	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify	-	1501 has
2	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of	2	has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the
23	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended	2	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you.
2 3 4	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government	2 3 4	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies,
2 3 4 11:59:56 5	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office.	2 3 4 12:04:07 5	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document.	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document.	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement.
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians,
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements.
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document.	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD:
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD:	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not?
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before?	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have.	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12:04:43 15	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well.
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page?	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations?
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17 18	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements."	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17 18 19	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements." MR. GINGOLD: Can we go back to the previous page,	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18 19	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that we had information of monies going out from the system well,
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:44 20	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements." MR. GINGOLD: Can we go back to the previous page, please?	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18 19 12:05:02 20	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that we had information of monies going out from the system well, let me start again.
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:44 20 21	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements." MR. GINGOLD: Can we go back to the previous page, please? A. So here's the section that begins this is the information	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18 19 12:05:02 20 21	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that we had information of monies going out from the system well, let me start again. We had information of monies going out from the Trust,
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:44 20 21 22	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements." MR. GINGOLD: Can we go back to the previous page, please? A. So here's the section that begins this is the information that begins, "Receipts." The next page begins, "Disbursements."	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18 19 12:05:02 20 21 22	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that we had information of monies going out from the system well, let me start again. We had information of monies going out from the Trust, be it through check or electronic funds transfer, we can
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 21 22 23 24	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements." MR. GINGOLD: Can we go back to the previous page, please? A. So here's the section that begins this is the information that begins, "Receipts." The next page begins, "Disbursements." So there are sections where they're identifying the individual areas for receipts and disbursements.	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18 19 12:05:02 20 21 22 23	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that we had information of monies going out from the system well, let me start again. We had information of monies going out from the Trust, be it through check or electronic funds transfer, we can identify what monies went out. We used that information, and that sometimes there were lots of other things that might have
2 3 4 11:59:56 5 6 7 8 9 12:00:47 10 11 12 13 14 12:01:25 15 16 17 18 19 12:01:44 20 21 22 23	1499 MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 87. This is a document that is identified as reports of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918. It's Indian Affairs, Washington Government Printing Office. I would like to turn to page five of this document. Excuse me. Before we turn to page five of the document, I would like to turn to page four of the document. Let's pull up Plaintiffs' 92. PX-92 is another report of the Department of Interior, 1919. It is identified as House of Representatives. And I would like to turn to page four of this document. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. Have you reviewed this document before? A. Yes, I have. Q. And what do you understand is stated on that page? A. This document talks about disbursements and revenues. This particular page begins the bottom begins, "Disbursements." MR. GINGOLD: Can we go back to the previous page, please? A. So here's the section that begins this is the information that begins, "Receipts." The next page begins, "Disbursements." So there are sections where they're identifying the individual	2 3 4 12:04:07 5 6 7 8 9 12:04:27 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:04:43 15 16 17 18 19 12:05:02 20 21 22 23 24	1501 has MR. GINGOLD: Can we get a little more clarity on the last paragraph? Thank you. A. Focusing on individual Indian and miscellaneous monies, these are disbursements. It says paid to Indians of 1.8 million, then purchase of Liberty Loan bonds. Again, the purchasing of a bond would still be an investment but it is counted as a disbursement. So if the disbursements for that year, this would be counted as not necessarily two paid out to individual Indians, but there are lots of things in disbursements. BY MR. GINGOLD: Q. And you also identified another investment, did you not? A. Again, purchasing of war savings stamps is another investment as well. Q. Why was this information important to you in your calculations? A. Well, when we looked at disbursements, the time period that we had information of monies going out from the system well, let me start again. We had information of monies going out from the Trust, be it through check or electronic funds transfer, we can identify what monies went out. We used that information, and

Page 1498 to 1501 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1502		1504
1	other years when there was reported disbursement information.	1	THE COURT: So you will consider the redemption amount
2	Hence, we used this ratio adjustment for when we had	2	of a war bond to be a receipt, but not the purchase of it as a
3	specific information, as opposed to the numbers we were provided	3	disbursement?
4	by the defendants.	4	THE WITNESS: From what we identified as receipts,
12:05:37 5	Q. Did you review any other documents that identified	12:08:19 5	there were no identified as war bonds that were being receipts
6	disbursements from the Trust other than check or EFT?	6	into the system. If the war bond is a disbursement and then
7	A. Again, in that time period what we were specifically focused	7	later was a receipt in the system, by treating one and not the
8	on, the 1988, when we had check and EFT information, then we	8	other, that would be incorrect.
9	focused on that and we used that.	9	But we don't see that, and I don't take any specific
12:06:02 10	For 1909, the reported information for 1909, 1910, and	12:08:35 10	adjustment in a year for a war bond, just noticing that in
11	1911, talked about what the disbursements were. There were no	11	disbursements there's often things that don't look like a
12	mention of things like purchasing of assets or anything like	12	disbursement to an individual, as an example. We don't take any
13	that, so we used that reported information for that earlier time	13	specific adjustments.
14	period.	14	THE COURT: So you are basically explaining to me why
12:06:17 15	Q. Why did you use that information	12:08:50 15	you use an average number instead of a number that appears in an
16	THE COURT: Let me just interrupt you a minute here to	16	account here. You're not saying that you backed out of
17	make sure I understand what you're saying. Are you saying that	17	disbursement numbers funds that were used to invest in war bonds
18	for these war years, World War I years, you backed out the	18	or savings stamps or things like that?
19	purchase of Liberty bonds from the disbursement numbers because	19	THE WITNESS: No, this particular year, there was not
12:06:33 20	you didn't consider them disbursements?	12:09:07 20	enough information for total disbursements, it's only for a
12.06.33 20 21	•	12.09.07 20 21	subset. So we looked at that and we did not back out there
22	THE WITNESS: The World War I years, I believe were missing years for disbursement information. We didn't have	22	was no calculation that backs it out. When the information was
23	disbursement information at all. In those particular years we	23	
23		23	absolutely missing, we used an average.
12:06:52 25	used an average. Showing this exhibit or showing the illustration here, was more to say there's oftentimes something	12:09:23 25	THE COURT: And just for comparison purposes, we have a number, you just showed me a number that included money paid to
12.06.52	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>	12.09.23	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1503		1505
1	in disbursements that we don't know if we reported a number	1	Indians, money paid for war bonds, money paid for savings
2	of disbursement, don't always know what's included in that	2	stamps, and a total number identified as disbursements.
3	number. We were just given the bottom line number.	3	Dr. Palmer says he doesn't consider that a good number for
4	For a year where disbursements were actually identified	4	disbursements so he used a substitute number. What's the
12:07:09 5	of all the different component pieces, we see there was an	12:09:44 5	comparison between that number and the substitute number?
6	investment in there that was identified as disbursement.	6	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the government didn't use
7	If we only got the bottom line number here, we wouldn't	7	that number either because that is solely relating to the five
8	know that there was a big chunk of that, in fact the majority of	8	civilized tribes. There is no similar number for the remainder
9	it, went to purchase an asset.	9	of the Trust beneficiaries or members of other tribes.
12:07:23 10	THE COURT: Yeah, but just do you not consider the	12:09:56 10	So it was a subset of whatever was done during that
11	expenditure of IIM monies for war bonds to be a disbursement?	11	particular year. It wasn't enough information to include as the
12	THE WITNESS: From what my understanding of a	12	disbursement total from the Trust.
13	disbursement is money that goes to individual Indians. If a	13	THE COURT: Nobody is using that disbursement?
14	purchase of an asset, that the Trust still holds that asset, is	14	MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.
12:07:43 15	not to an individual Indian, so it still sits in the Trust. So	12:10:08 15	THE COURT: So I just wasted five minutes of your time?
16	the redemption of that war bond	16	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor, you did not. Because
17	THE COURT: Does it sit in the Trust or does it go out	17	Dr. Palmer was explaining why it was necessary to evaluate what
18		18	
			constitutes a dispursement and what doesn't, and that explained
19	to a war bond account?	19	constitutes a disbursement and what doesn't, and that explained further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure
19 12:07:55 20	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it	19 12:10:26 20	further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure
12:07:55 20	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it doesn't go to an individual Indian.	12:10:26 20	further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure that checks and EFTs were properly reflected as disbursements
12:07:55 20 21	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it doesn't go to an individual Indian. THE COURT: Right, but then the war bond gets redeemed		further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure that checks and EFTs were properly reflected as disbursements from the Trust.
12:07:55 20 21 22	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it doesn't go to an individual Indian. THE COURT: Right, but then the war bond gets redeemed at some point?	12:10:26 20 21 22	further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure that checks and EFTs were properly reflected as disbursements from the Trust. THE COURT: All right.
12:07:55 20 21 22 23	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it doesn't go to an individual Indian. THE COURT: Right, but then the war bond gets redeemed at some point? THE WITNESS: And those proceeds from that presumably	12:10:26 20 21 22 23	further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure that checks and EFTs were properly reflected as disbursements from the Trust. THE COURT: All right. MR. GINGOLD: This may help a little bit. It's not
12:07:55 20 21 22 23 24	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it doesn't go to an individual Indian. THE COURT: Right, but then the war bond gets redeemed at some point? THE WITNESS: And those proceeds from that presumably go back to the IIM Trust. So it's the Trust that purchases the	12:10:26 20 21 22 23 24	further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure that checks and EFTs were properly reflected as disbursements from the Trust. THE COURT: All right. MR. GINGOLD: This may help a little bit. It's not directly on point but I would like to bring this up for purposes
12:07:55 20 21 22 23	to a war bond account? THE WITNESS: If it goes out to a war bond account, it doesn't go to an individual Indian. THE COURT: Right, but then the war bond gets redeemed at some point? THE WITNESS: And those proceeds from that presumably	12:10:26 20 21 22 23	further why he was using this calculation that he was, to ensure that checks and EFTs were properly reflected as disbursements from the Trust. THE COURT: All right. MR. GINGOLD: This may help a little bit. It's not

Page 1502 to 1505 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1506		1508
1	Plaintiffs would like to identify Exhibit 139.	1	A. Because it's available it's still available to the Trust.
2	THE COURT: 139?	2	Q. The description here, deposit fund balances in the form of
3	MR. GINGOLD: 139.	3	either invested or uninvested balances, does that mean anything
4	BY MR. GINGOLD:	4	to you?
12:11:01 5	Q. This is an exhibit that's been introduced prior to your	12:14:00 5	A. Well, again, that would be the deposits from the Trust that
6	testimony, Dr. Palmer. And it is a document that's entitled	6	are not disbursed from a check or EFT, so it's not a
7	fiscal year 2009 budget of the United States, Office of	7	disbursement to an individual Indian; therefore, there would
8	Management and Budget. And first I would like to turn to	8	still be a fund balance that is held by the government. They
9	page five of this document, and I would like to highlight this	9	would hold it in this case if they bought Liberty war bonds,
12:11:27 10	figure on five, which is "budget deficit or surplus and means of	12:14:20 10	it would be an invested amount.
11	financing." Do you see that?	12.14.20 10	Q. Thank you, Doctor. I would like to go back to Attachment A,
12	A. I do.	12	Plaintiffs' 189-A. Column F, disbursements, what do the numbers
13		13	
14	Q. I would like to turn to the next page. In the highlighted	13	reflect in Column F?
12:11:46 15	section of this page it includes the following language:	14 12:14:48 15	A. These are the numbers that we had just talked about that
12:11:46 13 16	"Deposit fund balances may be held either in the form" "in	12:14:48 13 16	have been calculated for the different reasons for different
-	the form of either invested or uninvested balances. To the		years. And they represent the outflows from the Trust.
17	extent that they are not invested, changes in the balances are	17	Q. And if we can turn to page four of this document. Do you
18	available to finance expenditures and are recorded as a means of	18	see a total?
19	financing other than borrowing from the public. To the extent	19	A. Yes. There's the total for the nominal dollars in
12:12:07 20	they are invested in federal debt, changes in the balances are	12:15:07 20	disbursements is 10.67 million billion, I'm sorry. I'm in
21	reflected as borrowing from the public in lieu of borrowing from	21	the wrong units.
22	other parts of the public and are not reflected as a separate	22	Q. Excuse me?
23	means of borrowing."	23	A. 10.67 billion.
24	Does the invested versus uninvested balances issue have	24	Q. Thank you.
12:12:24 25	any relation to what you were talking about?	12:15:20 25	The last four columns deal with nominal benefit to the
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1507		1509
1	A. In our calculation of benefit to the government, this is	1	government, 10-year U.S. Treasury bond rate, accrued benefit
2	indicative of something that we're trying to capture.	2	annual and accumulated benefit end of the year. I want to ask
3	Q. But if you have trust fund balances, is it fair to say that	3	you about the first column, which is nominal benefit to the
4	trust fund balances include investments from this information?	4	government. Could you please generally describe what the
12:12:47 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. This is beyond	12:15:41 5	numbers in that column mean?
6	the scope of his expertise. There's been no foundation laid to	6	A. Certainly. For each year we calculated the corrected
7	establish why Dr. Palmer can offer these opinions.	7	revenues number. Again, this is a revenue number that would not
8	BY MR. GINGOLD:	8	have any interest included in it. Subtract from that number the
9	Q. You were discussing with the Court your understanding	9	disbursements for that year, and that would give the amount of
12:13:00 10	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor?	12:15:59 10	funds that were available to the government in that year.
11	MR. GINGOLD: I'm not going to continue	11	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace.$ Does it make any difference to you whether or not the funds
12	THE COURT: Well, he's asking a new question, so I'm	12	were held in banks or the funds were held in the Treasury?
13	assuming that what's happening is that he's beefing up he's	13	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection, Your Honor. Lack of
14	either beefing up the witness' expertise so that he can answer	14	foundation.
12:13:17 15	the question or he's asking a new question. So you can have a	12:16:18 15	BY MR. GINGOLD:
16	seat, Mr. Warshawsky.	16	Q. In your calculation.
17	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I'm asking a new question.	17	THE COURT: Overruled.
18	THE COURT: All right.	18	A. For this calculation there is no separation as to where the
19	BY MR. GINGOLD:	19	funds are held once they're available.
12:13:25 20	$\ensuremath{\mathbf{Q}}\xspace$. You were discussing with the Court the reason you did not	12:16:30 20	BY MR. GINGOLD:
21	consider the investment of trust funds in securities as a	21	Q. Can you explain why?
22	disbursement from the Trust. Is that fair?	22	
23	A. That is correct.	23	takes the nominal benefit and that benefit being available goes
24		1	
	Q. And you explained to the Court why you didn't believe it was	24	through and said, okay, we use the 10-year U.S. Treasury bond
12:13:44 25	Q. And you explained to the Court why you didn't believe it was a disbursement?	24 12:16:47 25	through and said, okay, we use the 10-year U.S. Treasury bond rate as an estimate of avoided costs or costs of borrowing. If

	1510		1512
1	the funds are held in a bank, then they're not they would be	1	a benefit to the government.
2	earning interest in the bank and are not charged necessarily as	2	MR. GINGOLD: Plaintiffs would like to call up
3	a benefit to the government, because all the monies at the end	3	Defendant's Exhibit 497. I would like to turn to page five of
4	are subtracted out.	4	this exhibit, please. I would like to highlight the language in
12:17:09 5	So if there were interest or things earned at a bank,	12:20:23 5	1933. Or if we can just focus on the language. Thank you.
6	those monies would not be included in what we're calculating;	6	BY MR. GINGOLD:
7	they would be in the fund, they would be subtracted at the end,	7	Q. Have you seen this before, Dr. Palmer?
8	so there's an offset, as it were, accounting for that	8	A. Yes, I have.
9	information.	9	Q. It states as follows: "Congress prohibited the payment of
12:17:22 10	So for the calculation, it's not important where the	12:20:37 10	interest on bank demand deposits and authorized the Federal
11	information resides where the money resides.	11	Reserve to set maximum interest rates on time deposits (Act of
12	Q. Does it make any difference that at any point in time the	12	June 16th, 1933) the BIA then closed all IIM bank checking
13	funds that are in banks are returned to the Treasury?	13	accounts and transferred the funds to checking accounts in the
14	A. Well, again, it doesn't I don't think it really matters.	14	Treasury."
12:17:40 15	So if we take an example, if the proceeds or if the nominal	12:20:53 15	Dr. Palmer, if in fact as a result of legislation in
16	benefit amount, the amount of Column G, if half of that were put	16	1933 all the bank deposits or nearly all the bank deposits were
17	in a bank and half of that were put in the Treasury, and at the	17	returned to the Treasury, how would you calculate the benefit
18	end of the year let's say there's a five percent interest rate,	18	conferred to the government if that event occurred?
19	so the amount in the bank would be let's say it was 100 in	19	A. That was kind of the continuation of my example, where the
12:18:05 20	each; 105 in the bank. And whatever the Treasury does with it,	12:21:16 20	funds went from the bank into the Treasury. The interest that
21	if they invested it, it would be 105. If they just used the	21	would have accrued on the banks, while the funds were in the
22	money and didn't borrow against it, then they would have	22	banks, would then also go with the fund into Treasury, and the
23	received five in benefit, so there's an amount there.	23	government would then have the benefit of being able to use the
24	If then we subtract it at the very end, as we have done	24	original amount of the fund, plus the interest that had accrued.
12:18:25 25	here, what the value was for the Trust, the amount in the bank	12:21:37 25	And the calculation then incorporates that going
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	1511		1513
1	would be completely washed out, and all we're really focusing on	1	forward, subtracts off of the end of the calculation what
2	would be the amount that was in Treasury and the benefit that	2	actually was paid to or what the value of the Trust was, so
3	would have been there.	3	
			those funds would have been calculated out.
4	Now, if instead the following year those monies went	4	those funds would have been calculated out. So for that time period that funds were not in
12:18:39 5	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only	12:21:57 5	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been
12:18:39 5	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the	12:21:57 5 6	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The
12:18:39 5 6 7	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's	12:21:57 5 6 7	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the
12:18:39 5 6 7 8	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that	12:21:57 5 6 7 8	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point.
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933,
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use.	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct?
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct.
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 13 14	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933?
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out.	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year.
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside.	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury?	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the IIM Trust. And then it calculates
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19 12:19:35 20	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury? A. Well, that was my first example, where if it sat outside, we	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19 12:22:59 20	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the IIM Trust. And then it calculates what the benefit what the potential benefit would have been,
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19 12:19:35 20 21	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury? A. Well, that was my first example, where if it sat outside, we have the total balance and it's subtracted out, then it would be	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19 12:22:59 20 21	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the IIM Trust. And then it calculates what the benefit what the potential benefit would have been, and cumulates that forward.
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19 12:19:35 20	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury? A. Well, that was my first example, where if it sat outside, we have the total balance and it's subtracted out, then it would be just a wash and it wouldn't matter.	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19 12:22:59 20	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q. Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A. That is correct. Q. Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A. That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the IIM Trust. And then it calculates what the benefit what the potential benefit would have been,
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19 12:19:35 20 21 22	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury? A. Well, that was my first example, where if it sat outside, we have the total balance and it's subtracted out, then it would be	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19 12:22:59 20 21 22	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q . Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A . That is correct. Q . Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A . That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the HM Trust. And then it calculates what the benefit what the potential benefit would have been, and cumulates that forward.
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19 12:19:35 20 21 22 23	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury? A. Well, that was my first example, where if it sat outside, we have the total balance and it's subtracted out, then it would be just a wash and it wouldn't matter. Q. So you would not include that as a benefit conferred?	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19 12:22:59 20 21 22 23	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q . Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A . That is correct. Q . Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A . That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the IIM Trust. And then it calculates what the benefit what the potential benefit would have been, and cumulates that forward. As we talked about, there's a subtraction at the end of
12:18:39 5 6 7 8 9 12:19:02 10 11 12 13 14 12:19:19 15 16 17 18 19 12:19:35 20 21 22 23 24	Now, if instead the following year those monies went into Treasury from the bank, well, again, since we've only calculated what the revenues were without interest, then the following year the Treasury has the 105 that it had or let's say it invested it, just as an example, so the money it had that it could deal with, plus the money it had from the bank, and then it has that additional money, the original amount that went in, plus the interest earned at the bank, available for its use. Again, the following year, then, however that money was used, if it were invested and it earned money, if it instead didn't borrow with that money, at the end of the day we subtract out all that was in the Trust in terms of balance, so the interest that would have been earned in the bank while it was not in Treasury, would have been subtracted out. So it doesn't really matter where the funds reside. Q. What if the deposits were never returned to the Treasury? A. Well, that was my first example, where if it sat outside, we have the total balance and it's subtracted out, then it would be just a wash and it wouldn't matter. Q. So you would not include that as a benefit conferred? A. It would be part of the calculation, but in terms of since	12:21:57 5 6 7 8 9 12:22:16 10 11 12 13 14 12:22:39 15 16 17 18 19 12:22:59 20 21 22 23 24	So for that time period that funds were not in Treasury, that information, that interest would have been accumulated, and then it gets subtracted out at the end. The government then has available to it all of the funds plus the interest on those funds for its use at that point. Q . Now let's go back to Attachment A, analysis of benefit to government. For many years or for all the years prior to 1933, you have a number in the nominal benefit to the government column. Correct? A . That is correct. Q . Now, why do you have the number stated the way it is in each of the years prior to 1933? A . That's going to be what the total value would be, because it's taking the revenue minus disbursements for that year. Again, that doesn't include any interest payments that would have been received by the IIM Trust. And then it calculates what the benefit what the potential benefit would have been, and cumulates that forward. As we talked about, there's a subtraction at the end of the day of what was in there. So if there was interest in things earned, then that would be subtracted out, so this would

Page 1510 to 1513 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1514		1516
1	exact item that year, because again we're subtracting out at the	1	out of the Trust in excess, so the amount that was available to
2	end, to make all those that would have been offset at the end of	2	the government would be reduced.
3	the day.	3	Q. So if you have a negative amount, what are you saying about
4	Q. So if a deposit was returned to the Treasury and the deposit	4	the benefit to the government?
12:23:30 5	was in the bank in 1888 and was returned to the Treasury in	12:27:09 5	A. That in that year there would not be a benefit. In fact, it
6	1934, you have a number that is .29. Correct?	6	would subtract off from the funds that were already available
7	A. I'm sorry, could you	7	for use by the government. So it would reduce the benefit to
8	Q. We're in Column G, nominal benefit to the government.	8	the government of having other funds from prior years, because
9	A. Right.	9	it was subtracting off of those funds.
12:23:47 10	Q. You have in 1888 .29 am I looking at a different24.	12:27:28 10	Q. From 1934 forward, are you dealing with the bank deposit
11	Do you see that number? Do you see the number .24 in 1888?	11	issue in your Column G, nominal benefit to the government, from
12	A. Yes, I do.	12	1934 forward?
13	Q. That .24, is that what you just described as the nominal	13	A. Again, as we discussed, the calculation does not look
14	benefit to the government if the deposit was returned to the	14	specifically where the funds are, because once the funds are
12:24:27 15	government or to the Treasury in 1934?	12:27:51 15	into the government's hands, available to them if it's in a
16	A. Well, the .24 number would be the amount that was possible	16	bank earning interest, that would be then credited later. So it
17	for 1888. If those funds were invested in a bank and returned	17	doesn't look specifically where the funds are located.
18	in 1934, there would be interest on those funds that were	18	Q. And let's go to the fourth page of this exhibit and look at
19	returned to Treasury, and then so there would be a cumulated	19	the total with respect to Column G, nominal benefit to the
12:24:51 20	number that would be larger in 1934 than the .24. That amount	12:28:14 20	government. Do you see the total, Dr. Palmer?
21	then would sit in Treasury and be available for the government's	21	A. I do.
22	use.	22	Q. And what is that?
23	The interest on those funds that went with them at that	23	A. The nominal benefit to the government over this time period
24	point, whatever the number would be in 1934, would also be	24	is, from 1887 to 2007, is \$3,971,000,000.
12:25:07 25	available and sitting in Treasury. And then to continue, at the	12:28:25 25	Q. Let's talk about the 10-year Treasury bond rate, Column H.
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net
	1515		1517
1	end of the day we subtract out what was sitting in the Trust, so	1	A. Okay.
2	that the cumulated interest between 1888 and 1934 that had then	2	Q. Why did you pick the 10-year Treasury bond rate?
3	been grown until the very end, would have been part of the	3	A. The 10-year Treasury bond rate, it's a conservative rate,
4	amount that was subtracted out at the end.	4	it's a rate that Professor Cornell and I had discussed. It's a
12:25:34 5	Q. So let's go to 1934 on the second page.	12:28:59 5	rate we previously used. It hasn't changed. I know there's
6	A. Okay.	6	been testimony about that rate. It's a long rate, it's a series
7	Q. 1934 appears to have a .83 number. Correct?	7	that's available back to this time period.
8	A. 1934, .83 was the amount in that year, yes.	8	Q. Is there a reason you didn't use a five-year Treasury bond
9	Q. So you didn't did you reflect a large deposit into the	9	rate?
12:26:01 10	government from the banks reflected in .83?	12:29:13 10	A. Again, the 10-year is about the middle of the road, it's a
11	A. No, that's the incremental amount from the inflows minus the	11	conservative rate, it's probably it is reflective of what the
12	outflows in that year, into the Trust.	12	government's borrowing is. There's lots of different time
13	Q. And why is it the incremental amount?	13	period rates that the government uses; this is again a middle of
14	A. Because it only accounts for the revenues and the	14	the road, it's an estimate that we used, it's what we had
12:26:19 15	disbursements for that year. It's not taking into account any	12:29:35 15	provided before.
16	interest income from any other funds, from any other balances	16	$\ensuremath{\textbf{Q}}\xspace$. And how does the Treasury bond rate affect the nominal
17	from previous years or anything else, it's just the incremental	17	benefit to the government?
18	amount for that year that would then be available.	18	A. The Treasury bond rate is basically kind of the amount or
19	Q. Let's look at 1933.	19	almost kind of like the opportunity cost. If the government had
12:26:37 20	A. Okay.	12:29:53 20	funds that if it had extra funds available for its use in its
21	Q. 1933 has a number, negative 6.50. Do you see that?	21	account, it needs a minimum balance in its account, let's say,
22	A. I do.	22	so it used those funds, it didn't necessarily disburse those
23	Q. What does that mean?	23	funds, but it sat it needs a certain minimum amount in its
24	A. 6.5, a negative amount would be when disbursements were	24	account. Then it could have those funds available, and it sat
12:26:51 25	higher than revenues, so that there was actually funds flowing	12:30:14 25	there, instead of investing them, or instead of having to borrow
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 kingreporter2@verizon.net

Page 1514 to 1517 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

	1518		1520
1	and issue more debt in order to get the funds there, that is the	1	Q. And let's go to page four. Page four, there's a total row,
2	rate that we used.	2	isn't there?
3	Again, those funds, if they were sufficiently large,	3	A. Yes, there is.
4	could have been in the cash account, could have been lent out to	4	Q. Is there a total for accumulated benefit end of year?
12:30:28 5	banks for overnight rates to have their minimums. But in the	12:34:06 5	A. Not listed there, no.
6	financial institutions there's always a minimum amount that	6	Q. Okay. If you look further down on that page under the
7	people need to have to make sure their checks clear. The	7	column, under that same page, if we can highlight the bottom,
8	government maintains a balance as well. This would have been	8	immediately under "Total" on the right-hand side, which is
9	something that's indicative of a rate that the government would	9	directly under the "Accumulated Benefit End-of-Year" column, you
12:30:46 10	have avoided borrowing costs.	12:34:32 10	have two numbers. What are they?
11	Q. Under the accrued benefit column, annual, what is that?	11	A. So the reported trust balance on September 30th, 2007,
12	A. What that does is then takes well, as it's listed there,	12	that's the amount that was reported for the balance, as we
13	it's Column J and H, so it's the amount that it takes from the	13	talked about earlier, subtracting out what the balance is of the
14	previous year, so it takes the previous year's cumulated benefit	14	Trust; therefore, the accumulated benefit over this entire time
12:31:15 15	at the end of the year, multiplies it by the interest rate, so	12:34:53 15	period, once we subtract out and give credit for all those
16	it says whatever was in the fund for the previous year, that's	16	offsets, would be 46.85 billion.
17	the balance of funds that were available for the government to	17	Q. Is this the same number as what was included in the original
18	use. It then calculates the rate on those funds, and that's	18	data that was used by the CRMO?
19	what that amount is.	19	A. The 423.69 I believe is the same amount.
12:31:30 20	Q. And what is the accumulated benefit end of year calculation?	12:35:17 20	Q. How about the accumulated benefit conferred minus the
21	A. So the benefit then takes the previous year's balance, it	21	reported trust balance?
22	adds the additional amount of revenues minus disbursements that	22	A. No, that number is different.
23	are available, and then it also adds what the benefit was in	23	Q. How is it different?
24	terms of its avoided borrowing cost, with the potential	24	A. Well, again, there were several different pieces of
12:31:55 25	available from it from that rate that we just discussed.	12:35:30 25	information. The model is the same, but there are several
	Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>		Rebecca Stonestreet (202) 354-3249 <u>kingreporter2@verizon.net</u>
	······································		······································
	1519		1521
1	Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it.	1	1521 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained
1	Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it.		pieces of information of data that we received or obtained
	Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it.A. Okay.	1 2 3	pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony,
2	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to 	2	pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items.
2 3 4	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? 	2 3 4	pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as
2 3 4 12:32:18 5	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus 	2 3	pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well.
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5	pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change?
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. 	2 3 4 12:35:45 6 7	pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down.
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much?
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was.
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous 	2 3 4 12:35:45 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember?
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 12 13 14	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 12 13 14	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind.
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 12 13 14 12:36:11 15	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch?
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16	 pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document.
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19 12:33:19 20	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. Ma then the final balance at the end is the 50.27 from the previous year, plus the 1.83, which was the incremental amount from the additional revenues, plus the 2.09, which is 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18 19 12:36:20 20	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Be back here in an hour.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19 12:33:19 20 21	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. M. And then the final balance at the end is the 50.27 from the previous year, plus the 1.83, which was the incremental amount from the additional revenues, plus the 2.09, which is this amount that is the benefit from either not having to lend 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19 12:33:19 20 21 22	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. M. And then the final balance at the end is the 50.27 from the previous year, plus the 1.83, which was the incremental amount from the additional revenues, plus the 2.09, which is this amount that is the benefit from either not having to lend out or from receiving monies. And that gives us the 54.19. 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18 19 12:36:20 20 21 22	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Be back here in an hour.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19 12:33:19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. Mnd then the final balance at the end is the 50.27 from the previous year, plus the 1.83, which was the incremental amount from the additional revenues, plus the 2.09, which is this amount that is the benefit from either not having to lend out or from receiving monies. And that gives us the 54.19. Q. Now, is that what you've done for each year through 2007, 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18 19 12:36:20 20 21 22 23	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Be back here in an hour.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19 12:33:19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. M. And then the final balance at the end is the 50.27 from the previous year, plus the 1.83, which was the incremental amount from the additional revenues, plus the 2.09, which is this amount that is the benefit from either not having to lend out or from receiving monies. And that gives us the 54.19. Q. Now, is that what you've done for each year through 2007, from 1887 to 2007? 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 14 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 10 11 12 12 13 11 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 14 12 12 13 12 12 12 13 12 12 13 12 12 12 13 12 12 13 12 12 12 12 13 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Be back here in an hour.</pre>
2 3 4 12:32:18 5 6 7 8 9 12:32:36 10 11 12 13 14 12:33:00 15 16 17 18 19 12:33:19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Let's take a particular year and apply it. A. Okay. Q. Let's look at 1914. 1914, under nominal benefit to government, you have 1.83. Correct? A. That is correct. So that reflects the revenues minus disbursements, so that's the incremental amount for that year that was not paid out that we talked about earlier. Q. And the Treasury bond rate, what is that? A. The Treasury bond, that's the loan bond rate for that year, the 4.16 percent. That would then be applied to the previous balance, the accumulated balance from the previous year. So there was 50.27, if we look at the very end column, which is also the amount at the beginning of the year. It takes that amount as the amount of monies available, or if there's an avoided borrowing cost, it's the benefit that were available, and multiplies it by that rate, to come up with the additional amount there, which would be the 2.09. Mnd then the final balance at the end is the 50.27 from the previous year, plus the 1.83, which was the incremental amount from the additional revenues, plus the 2.09, which is this amount that is the benefit from either not having to lend out or from receiving monies. And that gives us the 54.19. Q. Now, is that what you've done for each year through 2007, 	2 3 4 12:35:45 5 6 7 8 9 12:35:53 10 11 12 13 14 12 13 14 12:36:11 15 16 17 18 19 12:36:20 20 21 22 23	<pre>pieces of information of data that we received or obtained during the course of this litigation. Also from the testimony, some adjustments that were made to other data items. So as the data changed, the total number changed as well. Q. How did it change? A. It went down. Q. Do you know how much? A. I don't remember exactly what the original number was. Q. Approximately? You don't remember? A. I don't remember. Approximately within several billion, but that's not MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, this might be a good time to take a break, if you wouldn't mind. THE COURT: Are you going to refresh his recollection over lunch? THE WITNESS: I can look at a document. THE COURT: We'll go to lunch. MR. GINGOLD: Thank you very much. THE COURT: Be back here in an hour.</pre>

Page 1518 to 1521 of 1522 PDF created with pdfFactory trial version www.pdffactory.com

			1522
1	CERTIFICA	TE OF OFFICIAL	COURT REPORTER
2			
3	I, Rebecca Ston	estreet, certify t	hat the foregoing is a
4	correct transcript fro	m the record of	proceedings in the
5	above-entitled matte	r.	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	SIGNATURE OF COUR	T REPORTER	DATE
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	Rebecca Stonestreet	(202) 354-3249	kingreporter2@verizon.net

\$	182 [1] - 1442:15	1944 [1] - 1476:3	2	365 [1] - 1452:14
\$121 [2] - 1447:1,	183 [1] - 1460:6	1945 [5] - 1448:16,	2,100 [1] - 1459:9	372 [1] - 1450:18
5121 [2] - 1447.1, 1454:3	188 [5] - 1447:23,	1476:7, 1476:13,		39 [1] - 1460:15
	1452:24, 1474:9,	1476:14	2,229 [1] - 1459:5	
\$175,544,960.19 [1] -	1474:11, 1480:6	1946 [1] - 1476:17	2.09 [2] - 1519:17,	4
1485:19	1887 [7] - 1448:22,	1949 [3] - 1453:8,	1519:20	4 [1] - 1465:20
\$3,971,000,000 [1] -	1457:23, 1461:4,	1476:6, 1476:17	20001 [1] - 1439:13	4.16 [1] - 1519:10
1516:24	1469:15, 1475:10,	1950 [2] - 1453:5,	20005 [3] - 1438:13,	404 [1] - 1438:18
•	1516:24, 1519:24	1476:22	1438:21, 1439:4	404 [1] - 1438.18 423.69 [1] - 1520:19
•	1888 [5] - 1514:5,	1952 [1] - 1478:18	2001 [1] - 1460:14	
'50 [1] - 1453:9	1514:10, 1514:11,	1953 [1] - 1478:18	2002 [7] - 1473:7,	45.4 [1] - 1494:5
'54 [2] - 1453:5,	1514:17, 1515:2	1954 [1] - 1476:22	1476:25, 1480:22,	46.85 [1] - 1520:16
1453:9	189 [2] - 1458:7,	1955 [9] - 1453:4,	1481:16, 1485:11,	48 [1] - 1485:3
'55 [1] - 1453:6	1471:4	1453:21, 1457:1,	1487:21, 1488:2	497 [1] - 1512:3
	189-A [5] - 1444:3,	1457:2, 1477:2,	2003 [2] - 1480:21,	4th [1] - 1462:20
1	1447:10, 1456:5,	1477:3, 1477:5,	1490:1	_
1	1469:3, 1508:12	1477:18, 1479:8	20044 [1] - 1439:9	5
1,500 [1] - 1459:8	19 [3] - 1443:3,	1956 [2] - 1480:7,	2007 [10] - 1455:10,	50 [1] - 1486:2
1.34 [1] - 1495:12	1478:21, 1478:23	1480:14	1456:1, 1457:15,	50.27 [2] - 1519:12,
1.8 [1] - 1501:5	190 [2] - 1445:25,	1968 [6] - 1447:2,	1457:23, 1461:4,	50.27 [2] - 1519.12, 1519:18
1.83 [2] - 1519:4,	1446:2	1453:22, 1453:23,	1480:21, 1516:24,	51 [1] - 1486:19
1519:19	1906 [4] - 1451:11,	1454:4, 1454:10,	1519:23, 1519:24,	53 [2] - 1477:13,
10 [4] - 1450:19,	1459:6, 1459:8,	1455:4	1520:11	
1461:23, 1472:21,	1469:15	1969 [3] - 1455:5,	2008 [1] - 1438:4	1477:16
1478:14	1908 [2] - 1448:23,	1480:6, 1480:7	2009 [1] - 1506:7	54.19 ^[1] - 1519:22
10-year [7] -	1475:10	1971 [5] - 1455:6,	202 [5] - 1438:14,	585-0053 [1] -
1454:20, 1509:1,	1909 [8] - 1449:1,	1480:6, 1480:7,	1438:22, 1439:5,	1438:22
1509:24, 1516:25,	1474:23, 1475:13,	1480:14	1439:10, 1439:14	•
1517:2, 1517:3,	1475:16, 1475:24,	1972 [6] - 1455:4,	236 [2] - 1484:9,	6
1517:10	1476:24, 1502:10	1455:7, 1455:8,	1485:12	6.5 [1] - 1515:24
10.67 [2] - 1508:20,	191 [1] - 1497:15	1455:11, 1480:15,	24 [6] - 1438:4,	6.50 [1] - 1515:21
1508:23	1910 [1] - 1502:10	1480:16	1514:10, 1514:11,	607 [2] - 1438:12,
100 [2] - 1495:24,	1911 [6] - 1474:23,	1985 [4] - 1494:14,	1514:13, 1514:16,	1438:20
1510:19	1475:13, 1475:16,	1494:24, 1495:13	1514:20	607-7392 [1] -
1001 [1] - 1438:24	1475:24, 1476:24,	1987 [7] - 1448:22,	258.4 [2] - 1497:24,	1438:25
105 [3] - 1510:20,	1502:11	1455:7, 1480:15,	1498:11	6511 [1] - 1439:12
1510:21, 1511:7	1912 [2] - 1450:1,	1480:16, 1485:11,	27101 [1] - 1438:25	669 [2] - 1490:10,
108.3 [2] - 1493:22,	1475:12	1497:23, 1498:8	2800 [1] - 1438:17	1490:16
1494:1	1914 [3] - 1450:1,	1988 [9] - 1476:25,	29 [2] - 1514:6,	1430.10
10:30 [1] - 1441:21	1519:3	1480:22, 1481:15,	1514:10	7
10:30 [1] - 1441.21 10:41 [1] - 1468:20	1915 [2] - 1449:19,	1487:20, 1490:24,		7
10.41 [1] - 1408.20	1456:16	1491:15, 1491:16,	3	74 [1] - 1495:3
	1918 [1] - 1499:4	1492:11, 1502:8	_	74.45 [1] - 1495:1
1100 [2] - 1438:16,	1919 [1] - 1499:10	1989 [4] - 1493:10,	3 [2] - 1440:3,	74.5 [3] - 1493:14,
1439:4	1913 [1] - 1498:3	1493:19, 1493:21	1463:14	1493:18, 1494:2
12 [2] - 1478:22,	1920 [1] - 1449:19	1995 [2] - 1455:8,	30 [2] - 1478:18,	77 [2] - 1452:7,
1478:24		1455:11	1499:4	1452:21
12:36 [1] - 1521:21	1922 [3] - 1453:12,	1996 [2] - 1455:10,	30309-4530 [1] -	7th [1] - 1473:6
134.1 [1] - 1495:1	1453:13, 1475:12 1923 [3] - 1453:8,	1456:1	1438:17	1
139 [3] - 1506:1,		1997 [4] - 1462:20,	307-0010 [1] - 1439:5	8
1506:2, 1506:3	1476:3, 1476:6	1465:20, 1490:12,	307-1104 [1] -	U
14th [2] - 1438:12,	1933 [7] - 1512:5,	1405.20, 1490.12, 1490:13	1439:10	815-6450 [1] -
1438:20	1512:12, 1512:16,		30th [3] - 1452:2,	1438:18
14X-6039 [1] -	1513:10, 1513:15,	1998 [3] - 1488:1,	1490:1, 1520:11	824-1448 [1] -
1496:19	1515:19, 1515:21	1488:2, 1488:8	333 [1] - 1439:13	1438:14
15 [4] - 1441:8,	1934 [11] - 1514:6,	1999 [3] - 1485:18,	336 [1] - 1438:25	83 [5] - 1473:3,
1468:19, 1472:22,	1514:15, 1514:18,	1486:12, 1491:7	34 [2] - 1494:10,	1473:5, 1515:7,
1479:17	1514:20, 1514:24,	1:30 [1] - 1441:18	1494:18	1515:8, 1515:10
16th [1] - 1512:12	1515:2, 1515:5,	1:41 [1] - 1441:15	354-3249 [1] -	87 [1] - 1499:2
171 [1] - 1498:16	1515:7, 1515:8,		1439:14	
181 [1] - 1478:16	1516:10, 1516:12			
			1	

9	acknowledged [1] -	1494:22, 1497:21,	1510:19, 1510:23,	anticipate [1] -
0 (4) 1/20.0	1463:4	1497:24, 1502:2,	1510:25, 1511:2,	1468:9
9 _[1] - 1438:8	Act [1] - 1512:11	1504:10	1511:10, 1511:25,	anticipated [1] -
900 [1] - 1438:21	acting [1] - 1473:8	adjustments [6] -	1512:24, 1514:16,	1464:25
92 [1] - 1499:9	Action [2] - 1438:2,	1447:6, 1447:8,	1514:20, 1515:4,	Antonio [3] -
93 [1] - 1485:23	1441:2	1456:10, 1479:20,	1515:8, 1515:11,	1442:14, 1452:13,
93.6 [1] - 1495:24	action [3] - 1463:21,	1504:13, 1521:3	1515:13, 1515:18,	1469:3
93.68 [3] - 1482:17,	1463:24, 1464:5	administered [1] -	1515:24, 1516:1,	anyway [1] - 1453:20
1491:10, 1491:18	actions [1] - 1462:14	1442:13	1516:3, 1517:18,	APPEARANCES [1] -
94 [1] - 1495:23	active [1] - 1468:9	Administration [1] -	1517:23, 1518:6,	1438:10
96-1285 [2] - 1438:2,	actual [9] - 1480:22,	1477:17	1518:13, 1518:19,	applied [1] - 1519:10
1441:2	1481:7, 1481:8,	admissibility [1] -	1518:22, 1519:6,	applies [1] - 1463:20
975 [1] - 1439:9	1481:15, 1481:16,	1443:23	1519:13, 1519:14,	apply [2] - 1461:2,
	1493:24, 1495:6,	ADMITTED [1] -	1519:17, 1519:20,	1519:1
Α	1495:16	1440:6	1519:21, 1520:12,	appropriate [2] -
	add [4] - 1459:15,	advise [2] - 1441:6,	1520:19	1452:1, 1468:16
a.m [2] - 1441:15,	1483:2, 1483:4,	1442:1	amounts [2] -	AR-171 [15] - 1455:9,
1468:20	1491:24	advised [1] -	1466:14, 1491:11	1492:17, 1492:20,
able [12] - 1455:21,	added [3] - 1441:8,	1441:11	analysis [6] - 1443:5,	1493:2, 1493:3,
1472:15, 1473:20,	1456:18, 1482:23	Affairs [3] - 1477:18,	1444:3, 1447:11,	1493:22, 1493:3,
1474:4, 1474:7,	adding [1] - 1459:15	1478:17, 1499:4	1453:15, 1469:1,	1493.22, 1494.1, 1494:5, 1494:24,
1485:5, 1485:21,	_	affect [2] - 1496:5,	1513:9	
1490:18, 1491:7,	additional [7] -	1517:16	Analysis [1] -	1495:6, 1495:13, 1497:23, 1498:7
1493:4, 1512:23	1442:3, 1449:16,		1470:10	1497:23, 1498:7,
above-entitled [1] -	1471:12, 1511:10,	afternoon [2] -	Angel [28] - 1445:4,	1498:15, 1498:18
1522:5	1518:22, 1519:16,	1441:10, 1441:18	1449:21, 1450:10,	AR-388 [1] - 1489:22
absolutely [1] -	1519:20	agree [1] - 1496:6	1450:14, 1451:1,	area [1] - 1500:22
1504:23	address [2] -	ahead [1] - 1442:1	1450:14, 1451:1, 1451:24,	areas [4] - 1456:18,
according [1] -	1461:25, 1465:1	aided [1] - 1439:16	1452:22, 1453:3,	1476:8, 1499:24,
1465:10	adds [2] - 1518:22,	Akin [1] - 1462:3	1453:13, 1453:16,	1500:5
accordingly [1] -	1518:23	al [4] - 1438:3,	1453:18, 1453:23,	arguably [1] - 1454:2
1459:10	adjust [11] - 1447:19,	1438:6, 1441:3		argue [1] - 1466:10
Account [1] - 1451:3	1452:8, 1457:2,	Alaska [1] - 1489:25	1454:12, 1454:19,	argument [2] -
account [21] -	1459:11, 1469:14,	ALC [1] - 1463:7	1459:5, 1469:19,	1465:8, 1497:11
1466:2, 1466:18,	1476:11, 1486:16,	allotted [2] -	1472:21, 1474:2,	arguments [1] -
1466:23, 1472:8,	1494:19, 1494:20,	1449:22, 1449:25	1474:7, 1475:6,	1467:21
1473:6, 1485:8,	1494:22, 1495:14	allow [2] - 1478:6,	1475:23, 1476:1,	articulate [1] -
, ,	adjusted [28] -	1495:9	1476:5, 1476:11,	1461:22
1485:9, 1491:2,	1448:8, 1450:13,	almost [1] - 1517:19	1476:14, 1476:20	articulates [1] -
1496:8, 1496:17,	1450:17, 1451:20,	alternative [1] -	Angel's [1] - 1474:3	1465:21
1496:19, 1500:11,	1451:22, 1453:3,	1443:17	annual [3] - 1475:19,	aspect [2] - 1447:13,
1503:18, 1503:19,	1459:10, 1459:17,	America [1] -	1509:2, 1518:11	1466:12
1504:16, 1515:15,	1474:21, 1476:10,	1460:14	annually [1] -	aspects [1] -
1517:21, 1517:24,	1477:9, 1478:10,	amicus [2] - 1468:1	1485:11	1466:20
1518:4	1479:8, 1482:19,	amount [68] -	annuity [16] - 1447:8,	assert [2] - 1467:13,
accounting [1] -	1482:20, 1482:22,	1454:2, 1454:13,	1447:17, 1458:18,	1497:7
1510:8	1482:23, 1491:5,	1454:20, 1459:2,	1458:24, 1459:3,	asserted [1] -
accounts [8] -	1491:11, 1491:12,	1460:1, 1460:24,	1459:12, 1459:14,	1468:15
1465:24, 1466:15,	1491:23, 1495:12,	1472:4, 1479:20,	1459:17, 1460:24,	asserts [1] - 1468:6
1473:18, 1483:4,	1495:15, 1495:23,	, ,	1461:5, 1461:12,	
1489:18, 1512:13,	1498:3, 1498:4,	1482:14, 1483:25,	1463:8, 1463:9,	assessment [1] -
1515:14	1498:5	1484:9, 1484:11,	1466:13, 1469:13,	1446:20
accrued [5] - 1455:1,	adjustment [21] -	1484:21, 1484:22,	1469:17	asset [5] - 1500:10,
1509:1, 1512:21,	1447:17, 1452:22,	1485:9, 1485:22,	answer [3] -	1500:13, 1503:9,
1512:24, 1518:11	1447.17, 1452.22, 1460:23, 1469:21,	1485:23, 1485:25,	1483:15, 1497:3,	1503:14
Accumulated [1] -		1486:13, 1488:16,	1507:14	assets [2] - 1465:15,
1520:9	1471:17, 1475:8,	1488:21, 1491:1,	answers [1] -	1502:12
accumulated [7] -	1479:14, 1480:16,	1491:8, 1491:9,	1483:16	associated [1] -
1509:2, 1513:6,	1480:17, 1480:19,	1491:23, 1491:25,	anti [1] - 1443:5	1476:13
	1480:21, 1481:22,	1493:17, 1493:25,		assumed [1] -
1010.ZU. 1019.11	1/18/21/1 1/18/216	4504.4 4500.40	anti-trust [1] -	4.405-05
1518:20, 1519:11, 1520:4, 1520:14	1482:4, 1482:5,	1504:1, 1508:10,	1112.5	1495:25
1520:4, 1520:14, 1520:20	1491:13, 1493:23,	1509:9, 1510:16,	1443:5	1495:25 assuming [1] -

i	İ.	1	1	
1507:13	Avenue [1] - 1439:13	1510:17, 1510:19,	1513:20, 1513:25,	1460:17, 1490:6,
Assurance [1] -	average [43] -	1510:20, 1510:25,	1514:8, 1514:14,	1494:8, 1499:18,
1473:9	1454:1, 1471:14,	1511:5, 1511:9,	1516:4, 1516:5,	1503:3, 1503:7,
Atlanta [1] - 1438:17	1471:15, 1474:21,	1511:11, 1511:16,	1516:7, 1516:11,	1520:7
Attachment [31] -	1475:1, 1475:3,	1512:10, 1512:12,	1516:19, 1516:23,	bought [1] - 1508:9
1444:3, 1444:10,	1476:8, 1476:23,	1512:16, 1512:20,	1517:17, 1518:11,	bounce [1] - 1495:7
1444:13, 1446:2,	1476:25, 1480:10,	1514:5, 1514:17,	1518:14, 1518:20,	Box [1] - 1439:9
1446:19, 1447:10,	1480:13, 1481:14,	1516:10, 1516:16	1518:21, 1518:23,	box [2] - 1482:9,
1450:13, 1454:14,	1481:17, 1481:18,	banks [6] - 1509:12,	1519:3, 1519:15,	1483:24
	1481:22, 1481:24,	1510:13, 1512:21,	1519:21, 1520:4,	
1456:4, 1456:8,		1512:22, 1515:10,	1520:14, 1520:20	Branch [1] - 1439:7
1457:8, 1457:19,	1482:8, 1482:10,	, , ,	Benefit [2] - 1470:10,	break [4] - 1448:18,
1458:13, 1461:16,	1482:15, 1483:11,	1518:5	1520:9	1468:25, 1469:12,
1469:1, 1469:2,	1483:22, 1483:25,	based [13] - 1443:13,		1521:14
1470:10, 1477:11,	1484:20, 1485:25,	1454:18, 1457:11,	best [4] - 1452:11,	breakout [1] -
1481:2, 1482:7,	1486:14, 1488:7,	1459:4, 1459:10,	1461:7, 1461:14,	1454:11
1485:20, 1487:6,	1488:15, 1488:16,	1459:12, 1459:18,	1463:15	BRIAN [2] - 1440:3,
1487:18, 1490:22,	1488:18, 1489:2,	1469:18, 1477:10,	between [14] -	1444:5
1492:5, 1497:22,	1490:15, 1494:9,	1480:22, 1494:3,	1449:8, 1450:1,	Brian [2] - 1442:12,
1498:19, 1498:21,	1494:18, 1495:4,	1497:6, 1497:21	1453:5, 1454:5,	1442:19
1508:11, 1513:9	1495:7, 1495:19,	Based [2] - 1448:25,	1455:5, 1458:20,	brief [11] - 1442:16,
attachment [5] -	1495:22, 1496:3,	1497:24	1458:23, 1475:2,	1459:25, 1460:3,
1444:14, 1446:9,	1502:24, 1504:15,	basic [1] - 1448:15	1476:24, 1482:19,	1460:15, 1460:19,
1447:13, 1469:7,	1504:23	basis [1] - 1469:21	1488:22, 1492:8,	1461:10, 1461:19,
1481:6	Average [1] -	beefing [2] -	1505:5, 1515:2	1464:21, 1465:7,
attempt [1] - 1441:25	1483:24	1507:13, 1507:14	Between [1] -	1468:17
attention [4] -	averaged [1] -	BEFORE [1] - 1438:9	1458:22	briefing [1] - 1468:11
1477:20, 1478:21,	1477:1	began [1] - 1467:25	beyond [1] - 1507:5	briefly [2] - 1442:17,
1485:3, 1487:13	avoided [4] -	beginning [4] -	BIA [1] - 1512:12	1469:9
Attorney [1] - 1439:6	1509:25, 1518:10,	1459:8, 1463:23,	big [1] - 1503:8	
attorney [2] - 1467:5,	1518:24, 1519:15	1474:17, 1519:13	billion [4] - 1508:20,	Brigham [1] - 1443:2 bring [2] - 1497:15,
• • • •				••••
1467:8	aware [1] - 1456:25	begins [8] - 1477:22,	1508:23, 1520:16,	1505:24
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10,		begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11	1505:24 brought [5] -
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16,	aware [1] - 1456:25	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] -	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] -	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] -	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] -	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] -	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] -	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] -	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] -
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] -	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] -	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] -	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1448:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 14446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiares [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1477:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12, 1520:13, 1520:21 balances [12] -	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiares [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1477:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12, 1520:13, 1520:21	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 14446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1514:25, 1515:18,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12, 1520:13, 1520:21 balances [12] -	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1477:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1514:25, 1515:18, 1516:1, 1516:6,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:21 balances [12] - 1454:18, 1473:6,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2, 1509:3, 1509:23,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25 borrowing [9] -	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4, 1486:3, 1487:12,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1514:25, 1515:18, 1516:1, 1516:6, 1516:15, 1517:7,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:21 balances [12] - 1454:18, 1473:6, 1506:15, 1506:16,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiares [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2, 1509:3, 1509:23, 1510:3, 1510:16,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25 borrowing [9] - 1506:19, 1506:21,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:5, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4, 1480:23, 1490:8,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1516:1, 1516:6, 1516:15, 1517:7, 1517:20, 1517:24,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12, 1520:13, 1520:21 balances [12] - 1454:18, 1473:6, 1506:15, 1506:16, 1506:17, 1506:20,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2, 1509:3, 1509:23, 1510:3, 1510:16, 1510:23, 1511:2,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25 borrowing [9] - 1506:19, 1506:21, 1506:23, 1509:25,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4, 1486:3, 1487:12, 1489:23, 1490:8, 1492:2, 1493:8,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1516:1, 1516:6, 1516:15, 1517:7, 1517:20, 1517:24, 1518:17, 1518:23,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12, 1520:13, 1520:21 balances [12] - 1454:18, 1473:6, 1506:15, 1506:16, 1506:17, 1506:20, 1506:24, 1507:3,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2, 1509:3, 1509:23, 1510:23, 1511:2, 1511:23, 1512:1,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25 borrowing [9] - 1506:19, 1506:21, 1506:23, 1509:25, 1517:12, 1518:10,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4, 1486:3, 1487:12, 1489:23, 1490:8, 1492:2, 1493:8, 1497:16, 1498:9,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1516:1, 1516:6, 1516:15, 1517:7, 1517:20, 1517:24, 1518:17, 1518:23, 1518:25, 1519:14,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backs [1] - 1504:22 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:12, 1520:13, 1520:21 balances [12] - 1454:18, 1473:6, 1506:15, 1506:16, 1506:17, 1506:20, 1506:24, 1507:3, 1507:4, 1508:2,	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2, 1509:3, 1509:23, 1510:23, 1511:2, 1511:23, 1512:1, 1512:17, 1512:23,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25 borrowing [9] - 1506:19, 1506:21, 1506:23, 1509:25, 1517:12, 1518:10, 1518:24, 1519:15	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4, 1486:3, 1487:12, 1489:23, 1490:8, 1492:2, 1493:8, 1497:16, 1498:9, 1499:13, 1500:2,
1467:8 audit [6] - 1455:10, 1456:2, 1473:15, 1477:7, 1477:16, 1478:16 augment [1] - 1444:21 authorized [1] - 1512:10 available [40] - 1447:18, 1448:8, 1448:24, 1450:12, 1456:15, 1459:20, 1461:7, 1461:14, 1471:17, 1471:19, 1475:12, 1475:13, 1479:6, 1480:8, 1488:2, 1489:5, 1490:16, 1490:21, 1506:18, 1508:1, 1509:10, 1509:19, 1509:23, 1511:11, 1513:7, 1514:21, 1516:1, 1516:6, 1516:15, 1517:7, 1517:20, 1517:24, 1518:17, 1518:23,	aware [1] - 1456:25 awful [1] - 1477:8 B BA [1] - 1443:1 backed [2] - 1502:18, 1504:16 background [1] - 1442:16 background [1] - 1442:16 backup [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1450:15 bad [1] - 1480:1 balance [17] - 1449:1, 1455:2, 1496:17, 1508:8, 1511:15, 1511:21, 1517:21, 1518:8, 1518:17, 1518:21, 1519:11, 1519:18, 1520:11, 1520:21 balances [12] - 1454:18, 1473:6, 1506:15, 1506:16, 1506:17, 1508:2, 1508:3, 1515:16	begins [8] - 1477:22, 1490:12, 1490:13, 1499:18, 1499:21, 1499:22 behalf [2] - 1462:3, 1467:13 below [2] - 1486:8, 1486:9 Ben [1] - 1439:8 beneficial [1] - 1463:1 beneficiaries [5] - 1462:21, 1463:11, 1465:23, 1489:7, 1505:9 beneficiary [1] - 1466:1 benefit [48] - 1443:16, 1444:3, 1447:11, 1454:25, 1462:16, 1466:18, 1469:1, 1497:6, 1507:1, 1508:25, 1509:1, 1509:2, 1509:3, 1509:23, 1510:23, 1511:2, 1511:23, 1512:1,	1508:23, 1520:16, 1521:11 bit [2] - 1444:12, 1505:23 black [1] - 1446:17 blue [1] - 1483:24 bond [21] - 1454:20, 1501:7, 1503:16, 1503:18, 1503:19, 1503:21, 1503:25, 1504:2, 1504:6, 1504:10, 1509:1, 1509:24, 1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8, 1517:16, 1517:18, 1519:8, 1519:9 bonds [9] - 1500:6, 1500:9, 1501:6, 1502:19, 1503:11, 1504:5, 1504:17, 1505:1, 1508:9 borrow [3] - 1510:22, 1511:14, 1517:25 borrowing [9] - 1506:19, 1506:21, 1506:23, 1509:25, 1517:12, 1518:10,	1505:24 brought [5] - 1462:14, 1463:21, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1492:7 BS [1] - 1443:1 budget [2] - 1506:7, 1506:10 Budget [1] - 1506:8 Bureau [2] - 1477:17, 1478:17 BY [43] - 1444:8, 1444:16, 1446:1, 1447:24, 1450:21, 1451:12, 1452:16, 1452:25, 1456:6, 1458:11, 1460:7, 1460:18, 1468:24, 1469:4, 1470:11, 1471:6, 1473:4, 1473:25, 1474:12, 1477:15, 1478:20, 1480:5, 1481:1, 1483:21, 1484:4, 1486:3, 1487:12, 1489:23, 1490:8, 1492:2, 1493:8, 1497:16, 1498:9,

		i		i
1506:4, 1507:8,	case-in-chief [1] -	1495:20, 1495:25,	clear [2] - 1478:13,	1490:23, 1491:24,
1507:19, 1509:15,	1444:25	1496:12, 1496:16,	1518:7	1508:25
1509:20, 1512:6	cash [1] - 1518:4	1496:18, 1496:20,	clearly [2] - 1465:20,	combined [1] -
	cashed [17] -	1501:22, 1502:6,	1477:14	1472:18
С	1482:21, 1484:16,	1502:8, 1508:6	clients [1] - 1443:19	combining [1] -
	1484:17, 1484:22,	checking [2] -	close [1] - 1479:8	1486:24
calculate [11] -	1485:15, 1485:22,	1512:12, 1512:13	closed [1] - 1512:12	comment [1] -
1454:24, 1469:16,	1485:25, 1486:12,	checks [61] - 1472:7,	closely [2] - 1444:19,	1452:2
1471:7, 1483:2,	1486:15, 1488:25,	1479:21, 1480:11,	1444:20	Commercial [1] -
1485:25, 1487:4,	1491:8, 1491:9,	1481:9, 1482:8,		1439:7
1488:21, 1492:14,	1491:12, 1496:3,	1482:10, 1482:11,	COBELL [1] - 1438:2	
1493:15, 1494:3,	1496:14, 1496:20,	1482:12, 1482:15,	Cobell [1] - 1441:3	compare [5] -
1512:17	1498:14, 1490.20, 1498:1	1482:16, 1482:18,	code [2] - 1486:11,	1446:9, 1446:10,
Calculated [1] -			1489:9	1446:12, 1479:23,
1458:14	categories [2] -	1482:20, 1482:21,	collection [2] -	1479:24
calculated [15] -	1488:18, 1500:25	1483:4, 1483:23,	1446:15, 1465:15	compared [2] -
1448:2, 1456:7,	CDs [1] - 1486:23	1483:24, 1484:10,	collections [4] -	1446:3, 1481:13
1458:17, 1469:5,	cents [1] - 1485:17	1484:11, 1484:16,	1446:3, 1446:8,	comparing [1] -
1477:11, 1480:18,	certain [2] - 1466:20,	1484:17, 1484:18,	1452:4, 1452:6	1454:14
1481:22, 1483:11,	1517:23	1484:19, 1484:20,	collective [2] -	comparison [3] -
1481.22, 1483.11, 1488:15, 1493:16,	Certainly [1] - 1509:6	1485:8, 1485:15,	1465:16, 1466:19	1493:4, 1504:24,
	certainly [5] -	1485:25, 1486:8,	collects [2] -	1505:5
1497:25, 1508:15, 1509:6, 1511:6,	1441:23, 1441:25,	1486:12, 1486:14,	1465:11, 1465:12	complete [1] -
	1443:24, 1467:19,	1487:3, 1487:23,	color [1] - 1479:14	1483:15
1513:3	1468:11	1488:17, 1488:19,	COLUMBIA [1] -	completed [1] -
calculates [2] -	CERTIFICATE [1] -	1488:20, 1488:21,	1438:1	1493:9
1513:19, 1518:18	1522:1	1488:24, 1488:25,	column [23] -	completely [2] -
calculating [1] -	certification [1] -	1489:1, 1489:3,	1447:17, 1448:10,	1479:12, 1511:1
1510:6	1464:10	1489:6, 1489:8,	1449:14, 1451:20,	complex [1] -
calculation [31] -	certified [3] -	1489:10, 1489:11,	1458:6, 1470:9,	1467:21
1443:16, 1443:17,	1462:20, 1464:7,	1491:2, 1491:8,	1470:19, 1474:13,	component [3] -
1457:10, 1457:24,	1465:18	1491:9, 1491:10,		1447:14, 1498:20,
1458:20, 1458:23,	certify [1] - 1522:3	1491:12, 1493:7,	1474:16, 1476:4,	1503:5
1458:25, 1469:18,	challenge [1] -	1493:17, 1494:4,	1491:13, 1491:14,	comprehensive [1] -
1471:10, 1471:11,	1443:24	1494:15, 1495:16,	1492:11, 1493:10,	-
1472:12, 1472:14,		1496:2, 1496:7,	1493:13, 1498:11,	1483:15
1479:3, 1481:17,	change [9] -	1498:1, 1505:20,	1509:3, 1509:5,	comprised [1] -
1483:17, 1483:18,	1448:14, 1449:24,	1518:7	1513:12, 1518:11,	1447:16
1487:8, 1495:20,	1450:2, 1450:4,	chief [1] - 1444:25	1519:12, 1520:7,	comptroller [2] -
1497:6, 1498:5,	1457:24, 1496:1,	CHRISTOPHER [1] -	1520:9	1477:19, 1478:18
1504:22, 1505:19,	1496:18, 1521:6	1439:2	Column [38] -	computer [1] -
1507:1, 1509:16,	changed [11] -		1447:18, 1456:9,	1439:16
1509:18, 1510:10,	1442:10, 1445:18,	chunk [1] - 1503:8	1457:10, 1457:14,	computer-aided [1] -
1511:24, 1512:25,	1445:19, 1454:16,	cite [1] - 1467:4	1457:20, 1458:6,	1439:16
1513:1, 1516:13,	1455:23, 1469:25,	Civil [3] - 1438:2,	1458:13, 1470:20,	concern [7] - 1465:6,
1518:20	1470:1, 1471:11,	1439:8, 1441:2	1482:19, 1482:20,	1465:7, 1477:6,
calculations [6] -	1517:5, 1521:4	civilized [1] - 1505:8	1487:13, 1491:4,	1477:8, 1479:4,
1448:5, 1470:3,	changes [3] -	claimed [1] - 1460:1	1491:18, 1491:21,	1479:11, 1500:15
1470:15, 1470.3,	1469:24, 1506:17,	claims [3] - 1464:7,	1491:22, 1492:3,	concerned [1] -
1490:19, 1501:17	1506:20	1464:8, 1464:9	1492:5, 1492:8,	1478:3
	characterize [1] -	Claims [6] - 1462:16,	1492:15, 1492:16,	concerns [2] -
cannot [1] - 1467:1	1497:1	1463:24, 1464:2,	1492:17, 1492:20,	1455:24, 1478:8
capture [1] - 1507:2	characterized [1] -	1464:14, 1464:20,	1493:16, 1493:19,	conditions [2] -
captures [1] - 1481:8	1463:8	1467:5	1493:20, 1493:24,	1479:11, 1479:12
Carolina [1] -	charged [1] - 1510:2	clarity [3] - 1448:4,	1495:19, 1508:12,	conduct [1] -
1438:25	chart [1] - 1446:21	1488:14, 1501:2	1508:13, 1510:16,	1441:25
case [13] - 1442:2,		class [10] - 1462:20,	1514:8, 1516:11,	
1442:21, 1444:25,	check [22] - 1452:10,	1464:6, 1464:10,	1516:19, 1516:25,	conferred [4] -
1459:19, 1463:25,	1480:23, 1481:25,	1465:19, 1465:23,	1518:13	1443:16, 1511:23,
1464:16, 1465:18,	1483:25, 1484:20,	1466:3, 1466:12,		1512:18, 1520:20
1466:9, 1467:3,	1487:4, 1487:22,	1466:22, 1466:24,	columns [8] -	confirms [1] -
1400.0, 1407.0,	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1700.22, 1700.24,	1447:14, 1469:5,	1473:22
1468:2, 1468:6,	1488:15, 1488:16,	1467.14		
	1488:18, 1494:13,	1467:14	1469:7, 1471:5,	conflicts [1] -

1442:22	1476:12, 1476:18,	1521:18, 1521:20,		decay [1] - 1488:9
	1476:12, 1476:18, 1476:21, 1489:15,	1521:16, 1521:20, 1522:10	D	
Congress [3] - 1477:16, 1478:16,	1476:21, 1489:15, 1491:19, 1497:8,	1522:1, 1522:10 Court [28] - 1439:11,	D.C [5] - 1438:4,	decision [2] -
1477.16, 1476.16, 1512:9	1505:14, 1507:23,	1439:12, 1441:6,	1438:21, 1439:4,	1452:2, 1467:5
conjunction [1] -	1513:13, 1519:5,	1439.12, 1441.0, 1441.1	1439:9, 1439:13	deducted [1] - 1463:19
1486:13	1519:25, 1522:4	1441:10, 1442:1, 1442:1, 1442:3, 1443:13,	damages [6] -	
			1463:22, 1463:24,	Defendant's [6] -
Consequently [1] -	corrected [8] -	1444:14, 1446:6,	1464:1, 1464:13,	1444:24, 1450:18,
1463:17	1446:2, 1446:10,	1452:3, 1457:11, 1457:16, 1458:15,	1464:14	1452:14, 1460:9,
conservative [3] -	1447:15, 1469:5,	1457.16, 1456.15, 1462:22,	DANIEL [1] - 1438:23	1485:12, 1512:3
1454:3, 1517:3,	1469:10, 1481:13,	, ,	data [63] - 1442:10,	defendant's [1] -
1517:11	1492:3, 1509:6	1463:24, 1464:2, 1464:14, 1464:20,	1444:14, 1444:21,	1460:13
consider [6] -	Corrected [1] - 1470:12	1465:5, 1466:13,	1445:17, 1445:19,	defendants [17] -
1501:25, 1502:20,		1467:4, 1467:5,	1447:7, 1448:7,	1443:14, 1445:10,
1503:10, 1504:1,	correction [2] -		1450:6, 1450:10,	1449:11, 1449:14,
1505:3, 1507:21	1469:11, 1469:14	1467:9, 1482:8,	1451:23, 1452:22,	1449:15, 1449:19,
Consistent [1] -	corrections [2] -	1507:9, 1507:20, 1507:24	1453:3, 1453:4,	1453:22, 1455:4,
1458:16	1469:11, 1469:22		1453:6, 1453:9,	1456:17, 1459:22,
consistent [3] -	cost [3] - 1517:19,	court [3] - 1462:15,	1453:10, 1453:11,	1472:4, 1475:8,
1462:17, 1476:7,	1518:24, 1519:15	1464:6, 1464:15	1453:10, 1453:11, 1453:14,	1477:4, 1480:9,
1495:15	costs [3] - 1509:25,	Courthouse [1] -	1453:17, 1453:21,	1481:20, 1483:1,
constant [1] - 1459:5	1518:10	1439:12	1453.17, 1453.21, 1454:5, 1454:6,	1502:4
constitutes [2] -	Council [1] - 1462:12	Courtroom [1] -	1454:12, 1454:15,	Defendants [2] -
1496:8, 1505:18	counsel [1] - 1467:1	1442:13	1454.12, 1454.15, 1455:4, 1455:25,	1438:7, 1439:1
Constitution [1] -	counted [2] - 1501:8,	COURTROOM [1] -	, ,	defendants' [2] -
1439:13	1501:10	1441:2	1456:2, 1456:13,	1445:13, 1483:12
contained [2] -	counting [1] -	CP&R [14] - 1474:24,	1458:4, 1460:23,	deficiencies [2] -
1457:14, 1486:16	1489:20	1480:10, 1481:8,	1471:17, 1471:19, 1474:25, 1476:1,	1477:23, 1479:7
continuation [1] -	couple [3] - 1458:12,	1482:1, 1484:17,	1476:5, 1476:8,	deficit [1] - 1506:10
1512:19	1459:2, 1481:5	1485:6, 1487:1,	1476:11, 1476:14,	defined [1] - 1463:9
continue [2] -	course [8] - 1441:20,	1487:5, 1488:12,	1476:19, 1478:4,	definition [2] -
1507:11, 1514:25	1445:22, 1449:11,	1490:19, 1490:24,		1465:20, 1465:22
continuing [1] -	1449:21, 1450:8,	1491:4, 1491:14,	1478:9, 1479:15, 1480:23, 1484:12,	demand [1] -
1442:22	1450:11, 1482:25,	1491:23		1512:10
continuously [1] -	1521:2	CRA [1] - 1443:2	1484:17, 1485:6, 1485:20, 1487:1,	DENNIS [2] -
1462:24	COURT [55] - 1438:1,	create [1] - 1486:25	1487:6, 1487:16,	1438:11, 1438:12
controversy [1] -	1441:4, 1441:8,	created [1] - 1484:21	1487:20, 1488:11,	Department [5] -
1464:4	1442:4, 1442:6,	credentials [1] -	1490:12, 1520:18,	1439:3, 1439:7,
copy [1] - 1441:12	1442:8, 1442:24,	1443:25	1521:1, 1521:3,	1477:18, 1499:3,
Cornell [11] -	1444:1, 1444:11,	credit [1] - 1520:15	1521:4	1499:10
1442:20, 1442:23,	1458:8, 1461:17,	credited [1] -	database [7] -	deplorable [3] -
1444:10, 1444:13,	1462:1, 1464:22,	1516:16	1483:2, 1487:24,	1479:11, 1479:12,
1444:18, 1444:19,	1467:19, 1468:21,	credits [1] - 1452:18	1488:1, 1488:6,	1479:25
1448:25, 1450:13,	1478:6, 1479:10,	criminal [1] -	1488:12, 1489:4,	deposit [7] -
1482:7, 1487:18,	1479:17, 1479:25,	1468:18	1400.12, 1409.4, 1490:4	1466:15, 1508:2,
1517:4	1480:3, 1483:14,	CRMO [1] - 1520:18	date [2] - 1460:14,	1514:4, 1514:14,
corner [1] - 1483:25	1483:20, 1491:17,	cross [4] - 1441:25,	1461:10	1515:9, 1516:10
Correct [12] -	1491:20, 1492:22,	1447:3, 1455:21,	DATE [1] - 1522:10	Deposit [1] - 1506:15
1448:11, 1448:12,	1492:25, 1494:6,	1472:23		deposited [1] -
1451:20, 1456:2,	1494:11, 1494:25,	CROSS [1] - 1440:2	dated [2] - 1473:6, 1490:1	1466:18
1457:22, 1476:17,	1495:18, 1496:6,	cross-examination		deposition [1] -
1483:23, 1489:7,	1496:14, 1496:21,	[3] - 1447:3, 1455:21,	DAVID [1] - 1438:23	1442:23
1513:12, 1514:6,	1497:3, 1497:5,	1472:23	DAY [1] - 1438:8	deposits [8] -
1515:7, 1519:4	1497:10, 1502:16,	cumulated [3] -	DC [1] - 1438:13	1465:12, 1465:13,
correct [24] -	1503:10, 1503:17,	1514:19, 1515:2,	deal [3] - 1467:23,	1508:5, 1511:19,
1442:10, 1445:17,	1503:21, 1504:1,	1518:14	1508:25, 1511:9	1512:10, 1512:11,
1445:18, 1451:18,	1504:14, 1504:24,	cumulates [1] -	dealing [2] - 1473:5,	1512:16
1451:21, 1456:3,	1505:13, 1505:15,	1513:21	1516:10	Deputy [1] - 1442:13
1457:12, 1459:1,	1505:22, 1506:2,	curiae [2] - 1468:1	debited [1] - 1496:19	DEPUTY [1] - 1441:2
1469:6, 1469:8,	1507:12, 1507:18,	cut [1] - 1496:18	debt [2] - 1506:20,	describe [2] -
1471:22, 1475:17,	1509:17, 1521:15,	CV [1] - 1443:7	1518:1	1444:9, 1509:4
. ,				,

	i	1	i	ii
described [2] -	1448:17, 1448:19,	1508:12, 1508:20,	1499:6, 1499:7,	1447:11, 1447:25,
1448:25, 1514:13	1452:9, 1456:23,	1509:9, 1513:17,	1499:8, 1499:12,	1448:25, 1449:21,
describes [1] -	1457:2, 1465:16,	1515:15, 1515:24,	1499:14, 1499:17,	1450:13, 1450:14,
1457:17	1467:18, 1471:4,	1518:22, 1519:6	1500:1, 1500:4,	1451:1, 1451:13,
description [1] -	1472:6, 1474:11,	disburses [1] -	1506:6, 1506:9,	1451:24, 1452:17,
1508:2	1474:13, 1474:16,	1463:6	1508:17, 1521:17	1453:13, 1453:14,
desk [1] - 1496:17	1475:5, 1476:15,	discount [1] -	documentary [5] -	1453:16, 1453:18,
detail [1] - 1471:9	1477:10, 1478:4,	1479:17	1449:5, 1449:20,	1453:20, 1453:23,
develop [1] -	1478:9, 1480:8,	discussed [7] -	1474:21, 1475:14,	1454:19, 1454:22,
1444:17	1481:14, 1481:16,	1457:9, 1463:19,	1476:9	1459:5, 1460:8,
developing [1] -	1481:21, 1483:7,	1478:8, 1498:10,	documented [1] -	1463:3, 1464:21,
1444:20	1483:8, 1483:9,	1516:13, 1517:4,	1477:7	1467:20, 1468:25,
devolves [1] -	1483:12, 1489:13,	1518:25	documents [16] -	1469:19, 1472:21,
1496:21	1489:20, 1491:14,	discussing [3] -	1456:12, 1456:13,	1473:10, 1474:2,
	1492:9, 1492:11,	1468:25, 1507:9,	1456:22, 1472:16,	1474:3, 1474:7,
difference [7] -	1492:14, 1492:17,	1507:20	1472:17, 1472:23,	1474:13, 1475:6,
1458:20, 1458:23,	1492:20, 1493:1,	discussion [7] -	1473:19, 1473:23,	1475:23, 1476:1,
1482:19, 1488:22,	1493:3, 1493:10,	1456:7, 1456:9,	1474:1, 1474:23,	1481:2, 1482:7,
1496:18, 1509:11,	1493:12, 1493:23,	1456.7, 1456.9, 1457:15, 1458:15,	1475:16, 1475:22,	1484:5, 1487:18,
1510:12	1494:1, 1494:2,	1457.15, 1458.15, 1461:19, 1467:10,	1473.10, 1473.22, 1483:12, 1498:22,	1489:24, 1491:17,
differences [1] -	1494:4, 1494:23,	1505:25	1500:3, 1502:5	1497:14, 1497:17,
1446:23	1495:4, 1495:18,	disgorge [1] -	dollar [11] - 1482:14,	1505:3, 1505:17,
different [31] -	1496:1, 1498:20,	1496:23	1482:15, 1482:16,	1506:6, 1507:7,
1446:11, 1448:1,	1500:11, 1501:8,	dismiss [1] - 1460:9	1485:15, 1485:25,	1512:7, 1512:15,
1448:2, 1448:19,	1502:1, 1502:19,	disregarded [1] -	1485.13, 1485.25, 1486:13, 1487:5,	1516:20
1453:10, 1453:11,	1502:22, 1502:23,	1453:15	1488:22, 1488:23,	draft [1] - 1484:5
1453:14, 1454:6,	1503:2, 1503:6,		1491:8	drafted [1] - 1484:6
1455:12, 1455:14,	1503:11, 1503:13,	distinction [2] -	dollar-wise [1] -	drawer [1] - 1496:17
1455:17, 1456:10,	1504:3, 1504:6,	1454:6, 1474:6	1488:22	driven [1] - 1495:19
1459:2, 1459:7,	1504:12, 1504:17,	distinguish [1] -	dollars [1] - 1508:19	drop [1] - 1493:19
1463:6, 1467:10,	1505:12, 1505:13,	1473:20		due [1] - 1473:14
1469:15, 1472:22,	1505:18, 1507:22,	DISTRICT [3] -	done [13] - 1441:25,	
1481:5, 1482:5,	1507:25, 1508:7	1438:1, 1438:1,	1455:5, 1455:22,	duly [1] - 1444:5
1488:18, 1495:3,	Disbursements [2] -	1438:9	1458:16, 1476:8,	During [4] - 1445:22,
1500:15, 1503:5,	1499:18, 1499:22	divide [1] - 1488:17	1482:6, 1482:7,	1448:23, 1469:20,
1508:15, 1514:10,	disbursements [59] -	divided [8] - 1483:8,	1484:1, 1493:25,	1476:23
1517:12, 1520:22,	1448:2, 1457:4,	1484:16, 1484:19,	1495:20, 1505:10,	during [18] - 1447:3,
1520:23, 1520:24	1471:1, 1471:7,	1493:2, 1493:18,	1510:24, 1519:23	1447:5, 1448:23,
digits [1] - 1485:18	1471:10, 1471:11,	1493:21, 1494:1,	DORRIS [1] -	1449:15, 1450:8,
Diplomacy [1] -	1471:25, 1475:9,	1495:13	1438:15	1450:11, 1450:16,
1443:9	1475:20, 1476:4,	dividing [2] - 1489:1,	double [1] - 1443:1	1450:17, 1451:5,
direct [4] - 1442:2,	1475.20, 1476.4, 1477:9,	1495:12	down [16] - 1458:3,	1453:9, 1454:11,
1466:23, 1467:20,	1479:3, 1479:5,	Dividing [1] -	1458:4, 1470:6,	1474:1, 1476:14,
1485:3	1479.3, 1479.3, 1481:20,	1484:19	1470:7, 1470:14,	1477:9, 1481:21,
DIRECT [2] - 1440:2,	1487:23, 1490:19,	Division [1] - 1439:8	1482:9, 1483:24,	1482:25, 1505:10,
1444:7	1490:20, 1490:24,	division [1] - 1492:8	1486:7, 1494:8,	1521:2
direction [1] - 1484:6	1490.20, 1490.24, 1491:4, 1491:25,	Doctor [4] - 1450:22,	1494:20, 1495:7,	DX-236 [3] - 1484:9,
directly [4] -	1491:4, 1491:23, 1493:24,	1460:3, 1500:21,	1495:12, 1495:14,	1484:12, 1485:12
1457:21, 1466:6,	1493.21, 1493.24, 1494:16, 1497:23,	1508:11	1495:15, 1520:6,	DX-272 [5] - 1484:9,
1505:24, 1520:9	1494.10, 1497.23, 1498:23, 1498:23, 1499:17,	document [35] -	1521:7 Data 1110-0	1484:24, 1485:3,
director [1] - 1473:8	1498.23, 1499.17, 1499:24, 1500:5,	1452:3, 1457:17,	Dr [73] - 1442:2,	1486:1, 1487:8
Dirk [1] - 1441:3	1500:6, 1500:7,	1477:5, 1477:6,	1442:17, 1442:19,	DX-371 [1] - 1455:16
DIRK [1] - 1438:5	1500:0, 1500:7, 1500:22,	1477:24, 1478:7,	1442:23, 1442:25,	
disburse [1] -	1500:14, 1500:22, 1500:22, 1500:25, 1501:5,	1478:14, 1478:22,	1443:11, 1443:20,	E
1517:22	1500.25, 1501.5, 1501:11,	1478:23, 1481:19,	1443:24, 1444:9,	e-mail [1] - 1441:21
disbursed [7] -	1501:18, 1501:25,	1485:13, 1485:14,	1444:18, 1444:19,	e-mailed [1] -
1466:6, 1466:8,	1502:6, 1502:11,	1488:9, 1488:12,	1444:24, 1445:4,	1441:14
1466:21, 1479:22,	1502:20, 1503:1,	1489:24, 1489:25,	1445:6, 1445:8,	earliest [1] - 1490:16
1493:7, 1493:17,	1502:20, 1503:1,	1490:1, 1490:2,	1446:3, 1446:4,	
1508:6	1503.4, 1504.11, 1504:20, 1505:2,	1498:14, 1498:17,	1446:8, 1446:15,	early [5] - 1441:16, 1466:20, 1467:17,
disbursement [68] -	1504.20, 1505.2, 1505.2, 1505:4, 1505:20,	1498:18, 1499:2,	1447:1, 1447:9,	1469:15, 1474:23
	1000.4, 1000.20,			1403.13, 1474.23
1	I	1	1	1

ę	i	i	i	i
earned [6] - 1463:13,	1438:2	1454:19, 1455:6,	1508:22	F
1510:5, 1511:11,	elsewhere [1] -	1459:1, 1459:2,	excuse [1] - 1448:22	Г Г
1511:13, 1511:16,	1452:11	1476:15	exhibit [14] - 1446:4,	fact [8] - 1441:14,
1513:24	employed [1] -	estimates [5] -	1447:25, 1455:16,	1443:7, 1459:7,
earning [2] - 1510:2,	1443:5	1449:7, 1449:13,	1470:8, 1474:14,	1460:21, 1463:8,
1516:16	End [1] - 1520:9	1450:1, 1453:9,	1477:21, 1478:13,	1503:8, 1512:15,
easy [1] - 1448:13	end [21] - 1450:3,	1474:7	1478:24, 1485:1,	1516:5
econometrics [2] -	1472:12, 1509:2,	estimation [2] -	1486:19, 1502:24,	factor [2] - 1452:22,
1443:3, 1443:12	1510:3, 1510:7,	1453:10, 1455:5	1506:5, 1512:4,	1497:24
economic [1] -	1510:18, 1510:24,	et [4] - 1438:3,	1516:18	fair [2] - 1507:3,
1443:4	1511:14, 1513:1,	1438:6, 1441:3	Exhibit [17] - 1444:3,	1507:22
economics [4] -	1513:6, 1513:22,	evaluate [1] -	1445:25, 1446:2,	familiar [2] -
1442:25, 1443:1,	1514:2, 1515:1,	1505:17	1447:23, 1450:18,	1471:25, 1472:2
1443:12	1515:3, 1515:4,	event [2] - 1492:14,	1460:6, 1471:4,	far [1] - 1498:11
edition [2] - 1441:17,	1518:15, 1518:20,	1512:18	1473:3, 1473:5,	fashion [1] - 1466:8
1441:21	1519:12, 1519:18,	evidence [7] -	1474:9, 1477:13,	February [3] -
effect [3] - 1466:10,	1520:4	1448:7, 1449:5,	1477:16, 1478:16,	1462:20, 1465:20,
1479:3, 1495:22	End-of-Year [1] -	1449:20, 1468:10,	1489:22, 1499:2,	1473:6
efficiently [1] -	1520:9	1474:21, 1475:14,	1506:1, 1512:3	federal [1] - 1506:20
1473:16	ended [2] - 1478:18,	1476:9	Exhibits [1] - 1440:8	Federal [3] -
effort [1] - 1464:10	1499:3	Evidence [1] -	exhibits [3] -	1462:15, 1467:5,
EFT _[18] - 1474:24,	ensure [1] - 1505:19	1440:8	1443:14, 1445:10,	1512:10 Fold (4) 1462:3
1480:11, 1481:9,	enter [1] - 1466:8	EVIDENTIARY [1] -	1445:14	Feld [1] - 1462:3 felt [1] - 1449:23
1482:1, 1487:14,	entire [4] - 1447:8,	1438:8	expenditure [1] -	figure [1] - 1449:23
1487:16, 1487:17,	1454:19, 1471:14,	exact [3] - 1458:3,	1503:11	file [1] - 1467:25
1487:19, 1488:7,	1520:14	1470:17, 1514:1	expenditures [1] - 1506:18	filed [4] - 1461:19,
1489:16, 1490:19,	entirely [1] - 1467:22 entitled [2] - 1506:6,	exactly [9] - 1451:22, 1453:20, 1465:21,	experience [1] -	1464:6, 1464:15,
1491:14, 1491:23, 1494:13, 1502:6,	1522:5	1468:12, 1472:19,	1466:7	1464:16
1502:8, 1508:6	entity [1] - 1465:17	1480:12, 1487:16,	expert [1] - 1443:11	final [1] - 1519:18
EFTs [8] - 1479:21,	ESQUIRE [13] -	1491:19, 1521:9	expertise [3] -	finance [1] - 1506:18
1487:23, 1488:4,	1438:11, 1438:15,	EXAMINATION [1] -	1443:4, 1507:6,	Financial [1] -
1493:7, 1493:17,	1438:15, 1438:19,	1444:7	1507:14	1473:8
1494:4, 1494:15,	1438:19, 1438:23,	examination [6] -	explain [10] - 1446:6,	financial [2] -
1505:20	1438:23, 1439:1,	1447:3, 1455:21,	1447:13, 1448:4,	1443:6, 1518:6
eight [4] - 1448:15,	1439:1, 1439:2,	1466:11, 1467:20,	1449:18, 1474:16,	financing [2] -
1453:2, 1477:20,	1439:2, 1439:3,	1468:10, 1472:23	1481:4, 1484:7,	1506:11, 1506:19
1478:13	1439:6	examine [3] -	1487:1, 1488:14,	finished [2] -
either [6] - 1505:7,	essentially [3] -	1473:1, 1474:25,	1509:21	1446:12, 1478:2
1506:15, 1506:16,	1473:20, 1482:14,	1481:19	explained [3] -	first [14] - 1441:15,
1507:14, 1508:3,	1495:2	examining [1] -	1457:11, 1505:18,	1441:16, 1441:17,
1519:21	establish [2] -	1488:4	1507:24	1448:10, 1448:21,
electronic [18] -	1448:3, 1507:7	example [19] -	explaining [3] -	1448:22, 1448:23,
1472:7, 1480:11,	estate [3] - 1462:10,	1447:1, 1448:14,	1443:13, 1504:14,	1466:9, 1485:16,
1480:23, 1481:9,	1462:18, 1465:8	1456:15, 1456:18,	1505:17	1485:17, 1496:22,
1482:23, 1483:3,	estimate [17] -	1483:16, 1484:1,	explanation [1] - 1457:16	1506:8, 1509:3,
1483:4, 1487:17, 1480:12, 1480:17	1447:21, 1448:24,	1490:24, 1494:14, 1494:23, 1495:22,	express [1] - 1465:7	1511:20 First [1] - 1483:22
1489:12, 1489:17, 1489:24, 1490:3,	1451:25, 1453:6, 1453:13, 1454:18,	1494.23, 1495.22, 1497:13, 1497:20,	expresses [1] - 1405.7 expresses [2] -	First [1] - 1483:22 fiscal [4] - 1478:17,
1490:11, 1490:14,	1455.13, 1454.16, 1456:21, 1458:18,	1497.13, 1497.20, 1498:12, 1498:15,	1465:6, 1479:4	1488:3, 1499:3,
1491:21, 1495:16,	1459:4, 1459:8,	1504:12, 1510:15,	extended [1] -	1408.3, 1499.3, 1506:7
1498:1, 1501:22	1459:13, 1470:1,	1511:8, 1511:20,	1467:10	five [11] - 1471:5,
electronically [1] -	1472:20, 1479:20,	1512:19	extent [6] - 1463:20,	1499:6, 1499:7,
1487:22	1490:14, 1509:25,	exception [1] -	1464:1, 1464:9,	1505:7, 1505:15,
eliminate [1] -	1517:14	1460:19	1465:14, 1506:17,	1506:9, 1506:10,
1489:3	estimated [13] -	excess [1] - 1516:1	1506:19	1510:18, 1510:23,
ELLIOTT [1] -	1446:3, 1446:8,	exclusion [1] -	extra [1] - 1517:20	1512:3, 1517:8
1438:15	1446:15, 1447:16,	1447:7		five-year [1] - 1517:8
Elouise [1] - 1441:3	1448:7, 1452:18,	Excuse [3] -		Fletcher [1] - 1443:8
ELOUISE [1] -	1454:4, 1454:12,	1491:17, 1499:7,		float [3] - 1496:7,

r	i	i		
1496:23	fraction [3] - 1452:4,	Generally [1] -	1512:6, 1521:13,	1466:17
Floor [1] - 1438:13	1452:5, 1485:22	1446:20	1521:19	quess [2] - 1441:16,
flow [5] - 1443:15,	fractions [1] -	generally [4] -	Gingold [8] - 1440:3,	1453:12
1447:12, 1458:25,	1466:14	1447:13, 1458:12,	1442:6, 1461:17,	guest [1] - 1497:12
1466:20	frame [1] - 1474:22	1471:9, 1509:4	1465:19, 1465:21,	GUILDER [1] -
	frank [1] - 1467:22	generation [1] -	1468:21, 1483:14,	1438:19
flowing [1] - 1515:25		•	1496:6	
fly [1] - 1467:21	Franklin [1] - 1439:8	1467:18		Gump [1] - 1462:3
focus [17] - 1447:12,	Frankly [1] - 1465:2	Georgia [1] -	given [3] - 1483:9,	
1450:19, 1451:13,	frequently [1] -	1438:17	1484:10, 1503:3	Н
1452:14, 1460:16,	1463:23	GILLETT [1] - 1439:3	GLENN [1] - 1439:3	half [2] - 1510:16,
1470:9, 1471:4,	Friday [1] - 1441:12	GINGOLD [101] -	GODFREY [1] -	1510:17
1473:10, 1477:13,	fund [12] - 1463:10,	1438:11, 1438:12,	1462:2	hand [5] - 1477:21,
1477:21, 1486:9,	1472:7, 1480:11,	1442:7, 1442:9,	Godfrey [1] - 1462:2	
1487:13, 1490:6,	1506:15, 1507:3,	1442:14, 1442:25,	governing [1] -	1483:25, 1484:23,
1498:8, 1498:20,	1507:4, 1508:2,	1444:2, 1444:8,	1464:19	1498:11, 1520:8
1500:24, 1512:5	1508:8, 1510:7,	1444:16, 1445:24,	government [54] -	handle [1] - 1468:17
focused [4] -	1512:22, 1512:24,	1446:1, 1447:22,	1443:18, 1444:4,	handling [1] - 1479:5
1461:24, 1462:7,	1518:16	1447:24, 1450:18,	1447:11, 1455:12,	hands [1] - 1516:15
1502:7, 1502:9	funds [68] - 1443:15,	1450:21, 1451:10,	1455:13, 1455:15,	HARPER [1] -
focusing [2] -	1447:12, 1458:25,	1451:12, 1452:13,	1458:17, 1459:1,	1438:19
1470:19, 1511:1	1462:10, 1462:22,	1452:16, 1452:24,	1459:2, 1460:1,	Hauer [1] - 1462:3
Focusing [1] -		1452:25, 1456:4,	1461:20, 1464:20,	headright [20] -
1501:4	1462:23, 1462:24,	1452.25, 1458:10,	1461.20, 1464.20, 1469:1, 1469:5,	1459:4, 1459:5,
	1463:1, 1463:5,	1458:11, 1460:5,		1459:6, 1460:2,
follow [1] - 1467:22	1463:6, 1463:7,	, ,	1472:19, 1475:25,	1460:20, 1460:21,
following [6] -	1465:12, 1465:15,	1460:7, 1460:16,	1484:12, 1496:11,	1461:10, 1461:13,
1449:9, 1453:25,	1473:5, 1481:10,	1460:18, 1461:23,	1496:23, 1497:6,	1462:16, 1462:19,
1506:14, 1511:4,	1482:24, 1483:3,	1462:6, 1468:23,	1498:18, 1498:22,	
1511:7, 1511:12	1483:4, 1483:5,	1468:24, 1469:2,	1505:6, 1507:1,	1465:10, 1465:13,
Following [1] -	1487:17, 1487:21,	1469:4, 1470:9,	1508:8, 1509:1,	1465:16, 1466:5,
1477:23	1489:12, 1489:17,	1470:11, 1471:3,	1509:4, 1509:10,	1466:14, 1467:6,
follows [2] - 1444:6,	1490:3, 1491:22,	1471:6, 1473:2,	1510:3, 1512:1,	1467:11, 1467:13,
1512:9	1495:16, 1497:1,	1473:4, 1473:25,	1512:18, 1512:23,	1469:13, 1469:16
footnote [9] -	1498:2, 1500:11,	1474:9, 1474:12,	1513:7, 1513:10,	hear [4] - 1445:2,
1450:15, 1450:20,	1501:22, 1504:17,	1477:12, 1477:15,	1513:11, 1513:25,	1445:4, 1445:6,
1450:22, 1451:8,	1507:21, 1509:10,	1478:12, 1478:20,	1514:8, 1514:14,	1445:8
1451:17, 1452:14,	1509:11, 1509:12,	1480:4, 1480:5,	1514:15, 1515:10,	heard [3] - 1464:22,
1452:17, 1484:2,	1509:19, 1510:1,	1480:24, 1481:1,	1516:2, 1516:4,	1468:11, 1468:12
1484:5	1510:13, 1511:18,	1483:19, 1483:21,	1516:7, 1516:8,	HEARING [1] -
FOR [1] - 1438:1	1512:13, 1512:20,	1484:2, 1484:4,	1516:11, 1516:20,	1438:8
	1512:21, 1513:3,	1486:1, 1486:3,	1516:23, 1517:13,	hearing [2] - 1442:2,
foregoing [1] -	1513:4, 1513:7,	1487:11, 1487:12,	1517:17, 1517:19,	1443:14
1522:3	1513:4, 1513.7, 1513.7,	1489:21, 1489:23,	1518:8, 1518:9,	held [11] - 1462:22,
forgive [1] - 1467:3		1490:5, 1490:8,	1518:17, 1519:4	1462:24, 1463:5,
form [3] - 1506:15,	1514:18, 1514:23,	1490.5, 1490.8, 1492:2, 1492:24,	Government [3] -	1463:7, 1463:14,
1506:16, 1508:2	1515:16, 1515:25,	1492.2, 1492.24, 1493:8, 1496:10,		1506:15, 1508:8,
former [1] - 1465:23	1516:6, 1516:8,	, ,	1458:14, 1470:10,	
forth [1] - 1479:13	1516:9, 1516:14,	1496:15, 1496:25,	1499:4	1509:12, 1509:19,
forward [4] - 1513:1,	1516:17, 1517:20,	1497:4, 1497:8,	government's [7] -	1510:1
1513:21, 1516:10,	1517:22, 1517:23,	1497:12, 1497:16,	1458:17, 1458:20,	help [5] - 1444:17,
1516:12	1517:24, 1518:1,	1498:8, 1498:9,	1458:23, 1459:13,	1448:4, 1497:13,
foundation [3] -	1518:3, 1518:17,	1499:1, 1499:13,	1514:21, 1516:15,	1505:23
1488:13, 1507:6,	1518:18	1499:19, 1499:25,	1517:12	helpful [1] - 1448:6
1509:14		1500:2, 1500:18,	grant [1] - 1468:7	Hence [1] - 1502:2
four [11] - 1449:18,	G	1500:20, 1501:2,	granted [2] - 1468:6,	Herman [6] - 1445:2,
1449:19, 1470:8,		1501:12, 1505:6,	1468:14	1455:16, 1455:19,
1470:10, 1470:20,	GAO [1] - 1473:5	1505:14, 1505:16,	graph [1] - 1446:14	1469:25, 1472:21,
	gathered [1] -	1505:23, 1506:3,	graphed [1] - 1446:9	1494:16
1499:8, 1499:11,	1471:21	1506:4, 1507:8,	grazing [1] - 1456:19	Herman's [2] -
1508:17, 1508:25,	general [3] -	1507:11, 1507:17,	group [1] - 1466:25	1450:15, 1469:22
1520:1	1458:15, 1477:19,	1507:19, 1509:15,	grown [1] - 1515:3	higher [8] - 1447:4,
Fourth [1] - 1438:24	1478:18	1509:20, 1512:2,	-	1481:24, 1482:10,
fourth [1] - 1516:18	General [1] - 1451:3	,,	guardianship [1] -	

t			1	
1494:5, 1494:10,	1457:9, 1457:22,	1479:12	1459:20, 1460:25,	1472:8, 1472:25,
1494:18, 1495:11,	1458:13, 1460:8,	inappropriate [1] -	1461:12, 1462:11,	1474:6, 1474:19,
1515:25	1462:10, 1462:13,	1449:23	1462:16, 1462:19,	1474:20, 1475:4,
highlight [4] -	1462:18, 1469:9,	include [8] - 1451:1,	1463:7, 1465:9,	1475:5, 1475:8,
1500:21, 1506:9,	1472:4, 1472:8,	1451:2, 1490:14,	1466:1, 1466:15,	1475:11, 1475:13,
1512:4, 1520:7	1472:19, 1475:16,	1490:19, 1505:11,	1466:21, 1467:6,	1476:15, 1477:3,
highlighted [8] -	1478:1, 1478:7,	1507:4, 1511:23,	1467:11, 1472:18,	1477:4, 1477:5,
1450:20, 1451:14,	1478:16, 1478:23,	1513:18	1473:16, 1475:21,	1477:10, 1478:1,
1460:16, 1473:11,	1489:3, 1489:9,	included [13] -	1499:23, 1501:4,	1478:3, 1478:10,
1473:13, 1490:6,	1489:24, 1490:23,	1447:20, 1449:25,	1501:10, 1503:13,	1479:5, 1479:7,
1500:22, 1506:13	1491:25, 1493:12,	1450:5, 1450:7,	1503:15, 1503:20,	1479:20, 1479:23,
historical [1] -	1498:23, 1499:2,	1454:8, 1463:20,	1504:12, 1508:7	1480:8, 1480:11,
1466:7	1499:10, 1501:13,	1472:9, 1501:25,	Individual [5] -	1480:20, 1481:7,
history [1] - 1461:3	1502:5, 1503:4,	1503:2, 1504:25,	1462:21, 1465:24,	1481:8, 1481:15,
hold [2] - 1467:11,	1503:6, 1504:4,	1509:8, 1510:6,	1466:1, 1477:17,	1481:18, 1482:1,
1508:9	1504:5, 1505:2	1520:17	1498:24	1482:18, 1482:24,
	identifier [4] -	includes [1] -	individuals [7] -	1484:8, 1485:4,
holders [1] - 1496:9	1448:11, 1448:12,	1506:14	1463:11, 1464:3,	1485:5, 1485:11,
holding [1] - 1484:23	1450:9, 1450:10	including [1] -	1466:6, 1466:21,	1485:21, 1485:24,
holds [1] - 1503:14	identifiers [1] -	1466:4	1466:22, 1467:16,	1486:6, 1486:13,
Honor [41] - 1441:5,	1457:10		1467:18	1486:16, 1486:23,
1441:9, 1442:7,	identifies [1] -	inclusion [1] -	individuals' [1] -	1487:7, 1487:8,
1442:11, 1442:12,	1443:7	1447:7	1462:25	1487:10, 1487:19,
1442:16, 1442:19,		income [3] - 1450:5,	inflows [3] - 1454:9,	1487:25, 1488:2,
1443:20, 1443:22,	identify [15] - 1444:2,	1465:8, 1515:16	1454:24, 1515:11	1488:6, 1488:13,
1461:24, 1462:2,	1448:10, 1448:18, 1455:21, 1455:23	incompetents [1] -	,	1489:5, 1489:11,
1462:6, 1462:14,	1455:21, 1455:23, 1472:15, 1474:4	1466:17	information [176] -	1489:13, 1489:19,
1462:17, 1463:8,	1472:15, 1474:4, 1474:25, 1476:10,	incomplete [1] -	1444:22, 1445:20, 1447:18, 1447:20,	1490:4, 1490:12,
1463:12, 1463:17,		1451:4		1490:18, 1490:21,
1463:21, 1463:24,	1480:12, 1490:18, 1494:17, 1499:1,	incorporate [1] -	1448:8, 1448:14, 1448:16, 1448:17	1490:23, 1491:1,
1464:3, 1464:12,		1471:15	1448:16, 1448:17,	1491:6, 1491:22,
1464:18, 1464:23,	1501:23, 1506:1	incorporated [1] -	1448:19, 1448:24,	1492:8, 1492:15,
1468:23, 1480:4,	identifying [1] -	1471:13	1449:1, 1449:4,	1493:1, 1493:2,
1483:19, 1492:24,	1499:23	incorporates [1] -	1449:6, 1449:8,	1494:3, 1494:13,
1496:10, 1496:18,	IIM [29] - 1456:15,	1512:25	1449:10, 1449:11,	1494:14, 1494:17,
1497:1, 1497:9,	1458:18, 1458:24,	incorrect [1] -	1449:15, 1449:16,	1494:19, 1495:5,
1497:12, 1500:1,	1460:25, 1461:3,	1504:8	1449:20, 1450:3,	1495:6, 1495:11,
1500:18, 1505:6,	1466:8, 1466:15,	incremental [5] -	1450:25, 1451:3,	1495:16, 1496:2,
1505:16, 1507:5,	1466:23, 1470:2,	1515:11, 1515:13,	1451:23, 1452:12, 1453:22, 1454:0	1495:10, 1496:2, 1497:21, 1498:12,
1507:10, 1507:17,	1471:25, 1472:4,	1515:17, 1519:6,	1453:22, 1454:9, 1454:11, 1455:3	1499:21, 1500:12,
1509:13, 1521:13	1472:5, 1472:11,	1519:19	1454:11, 1455:3, 1455:8, 1455:10	1501:16, 1501:19,
HONORABLE [1] -	1472:15, 1473:17,	indeed [1] - 1452:21	1455:8, 1455:10,	1501:21, 1501:23,
1438:9	1481:10, 1483:3,	independently [1] -	1455:11, 1455:12, 1455:13, 1455:14	1502:1, 1502:3,
hopefully [1] -	1483:6, 1485:9,	1464:8	1455:13, 1455:14, 1455:17, 1455:18	1502:1, 1502:3, 1502:10,
1441:24	1487:21, 1489:8,	Indian [13] - 1462:21,	1455:17, 1455:18, 1455:10, 1455:22	1502:13, 1502:15,
hour [1] - 1521:20	1491:3, 1496:8,	1463:7, 1465:24,	1455:19, 1455:22,	1502:13, 1502:13, 1502:23,
House [1] - 1499:10	1496:23, 1500:12,	1466:1, 1473:5,	1455:23, 1456:11, 1456:14, 1456:17	1502:22, 1502:23, 1504:22,
· · ·	1503:11, 1503:24,	1477:18, 1478:17,	1456:14, 1456:17,	1504.20, 1504.22, 1505:11, 1507:4,
	1512:12, 1513:19	1498:24, 1499:4,	1456:22, 1456:23,	1510:9, 1510:11,
idea (4) - 1492-19	illustrate [1] -	1501:4, 1503:15,	1456:24, 1457:2,	1510.9, 1510.11, 1513:5, 1520:25,
idea [1] - 1483:18	1485:24	1503:20, 1508:7	1457:6, 1457:7,	1513.5, 1520.25, 1521:1
identical [2] -	illustration [2] -	Indians [6] -	1457:10, 1457:14,	Information [1] -
1453:6, 1492:7	1496:4, 1502:25	1459:21, 1462:11,	1457:19, 1458:5,	1445:21
identification [8] -	imagine [1] -	1501:5, 1501:10,	1458:17, 1459:18,	
1445:25, 1447:23,	1461:12	1503:13, 1505:1	1459:22, 1459:24,	informed [1] -
1451:10, 1460:5,	immediately [2] -	indicated [1] -	1460:12, 1460:22,	1462:8
1473:3, 1477:13,	1496:19, 1520:8	1488:9	1461:7, 1461:14,	initial [1] - 1465:15
1478:15, 1489:22	implicit [1] - 1454:12	indicative [2] -	1469:18, 1469:20,	input [1] - 1445:19
identified [36] -	important [2] -	1507:2, 1518:9	1471:12, 1471:13,	inputs [1] - 1448:3
1446:2, 1448:13,	1501:16, 1510:10	individual [26] -	1471:16, 1471:21,	instead [8] -
1448:21, 1451:19,	inadequate [1] -	1456:11, 1457:18,	1471:22, 1472:6,	1482:13, 1495:8,

Î	Î	1		
1495:23, 1504:15,	1461:21, 1464:17,	1463:6, 1464:2,	1461:19, 1471:5,	1442:21, 1443:6,
1511:4, 1511:13,	1465:2, 1465:6,	1464:20, 1478:14,	1471:20, 1477:22,	1444:18, 1444:23,
1517:25	1467:6, 1467:24,	1478:23	1487:2, 1500:24,	1445:22, 1449:21,
institutions [1] -	1468:4, 1468:8,	1470.20	1501:3, 1508:25	1450:8, 1450:11,
1518:6	1468:15	J	late [1] - 1441:20	1450:14, 1453:8,
		5		
instructor [1] -	intervening [1] -	JAMES [1] - 1438:9	Law [1] - 1443:8	1459:24, 1462:7,
1443:9	1465:3	January [1] - 1452:2	law [2] - 1463:9,	1462:13, 1463:21,
intellectual [1] -	intervention [4] -	JOHN [2] - 1439:1,	1464:19	1463:22, 1464:9,
1443:5	1467:8, 1468:2,	1439:6	LAW [1] - 1438:12	1464:10, 1465:25,
intended [1] -	1468:5, 1468:8		Leading [2] -	1467:7, 1482:25,
1441:11	Intervention [1] -	JR [2] - 1438:23,	1473:24, 1478:5	1521:2
interest [46] -	1468:5	1439:1	learned [4] -	Litigation [1] -
1443:17, 1447:7,	introduced [2] -	JUDGE [1] - 1438:9	1444:22, 1445:20,	1439:7
1454:8, 1454:10,	1445:10, 1506:5	June [4] - 1438:4,	1445:21, 1453:8	live [2] - 1441:9,
1454:11, 1454:13,	invest [1] - 1504:17	1478:18, 1499:4,	least [7] - 1448:6,	1441:19
1454:17, 1454:20,	invested [10] -	1512:12	1453:24, 1461:19,	Loan [3] - 1500:6,
1454:24, 1455:1,	1506:16, 1506:17,	Justice [2] - 1439:3,	1468:5, 1472:10,	1500:9, 1501:6
1462:25, 1463:4,	1506:20, 1506:24,	1439:7	1481:7, 1490:12	loan [1] - 1519:9
1463:10, 1463:13,	1508:3, 1508:10,	JUSTIN [1] - 1438:19	leave [3] - 1467:25,	located [1] - 1516:17
1463:15, 1463:18,	1510:21, 1511:8,			logically [1] - 1482:2
1463:19, 1464:15,	1510.21, 1511.8, 1511:14:17	К	1468:3, 1468:15	look [18] - 1451:9,
	,		leaves [1] - 1489:20	,
1465:9, 1465:17,	investing [1] -	Kehoe [1] - 1445:6	leaving [1] - 1480:12	1470:20, 1479:22,
1466:19, 1467:17,	1517:25	KEITH [1] - 1438:19	led [1] - 1478:3	1481:7, 1481:11,
1468:7, 1509:8,	investment [8] -	KEMPTHORNE [1] -	left [3] - 1448:10,	1493:9, 1494:16,
1510:2, 1510:5,	1500:9, 1500:10,	1438:5	1477:21, 1483:25	1495:8, 1498:2,
1510:18, 1511:6,	1500:13, 1501:7,	Kempthorne [1] -	left-hand [2] -	1504:11, 1515:19,
1511:11, 1511:16,	1501:13, 1501:15,	1441:3	1477:21, 1483:25	1516:13, 1516:17,
1512:10, 1512:11,	1503:6, 1507:21	KILPATRICK [3] -	legislation [3] -	1516:18, 1519:3,
1512:20, 1512:24,	investments [2] -	1438:16, 1438:20,	1451:7, 1463:13,	1519:12, 1520:6,
1513:5, 1513:8,	1500:6, 1507:4		1512:15	1521:17
1513:18, 1513:23,	invited [1] - 1468:2	1438:24	lend [1] - 1519:21	looked [17] -
1514:18, 1514:23,	involve [2] - 1464:8,	kind [7] - 1452:10,	lent [1] - 1518:4	1441:23, 1446:12,
1515:2, 1515:16,	1464:9	1454:8, 1459:15,	less [1] - 1485:18	1452:9, 1472:5,
1516:16, 1518:15	involved [2] -	1482:11, 1512:19,		1475:19, 1479:7,
interesting [1] -	1442:20, 1464:5	1517:18, 1517:19	level [2] - 1452:1,	1486:14, 1487:2,
1467:21	involving [1] -	KIRSCHMAN [1] -	1495:15	1487:4, 1487:20,
interests [5] -	1467:7	1439:1	LEVITAS [1] -	1488:19, 1491:6,
1463:17, 1465:5,		knowledge [1] -	1438:15	1492:6, 1500:16,
1466:5, 1466:21,	IRMS [3] - 1473:15,	1463:16	liberally [1] - 1468:6	
	1473:18, 1490:11	knows [1] - 1461:20	Liberty [5] - 1500:6,	1501:18, 1504:21
1467:10	isolate [1] - 1474:10	KOHN [1] - 1439:2	1500:9, 1501:6,	looking [4] - 1477:4,
Interior [4] - 1438:6,	isolated [1] -		1502:19, 1508:9	1493:6, 1497:25,
1477:18, 1499:3,	1473:16	L	lieu [1] - 1506:21	1514:10
1499:10	issue [11] - 1457:1,		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	looks [1] - 1454:23
International w	loodo [ii] iioi.i,		limited [4] - 1467:16,	
International [1] -	1463:20, 1466:13,	L.L.P [3] - 1438:16,		lower [6] - 1454:16,
1443:3	,	L.L.P [3] - 1438:16, 1438:20, 1438:24	1468:3, 1468:14,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18,
	1463:20, 1466:13,	1438:20, 1438:24	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10	lower [6] - 1454:16,
1443:3	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18,
1443:3 interpolated [2] -	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12,
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8,	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16,
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5,	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22,	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25,	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16,
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] -	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] -	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] -	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 M MA [4] - 1451:20,
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] -	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16 interrupted [1] -	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24, 1498:23, 1500:5,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] - 1473:13, 1506:14,	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6 lines [1] - 1452:17	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17 machine [1] -
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16 interrupted [1] - 1468:16	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] - 1473:13, 1506:14, 1512:4, 1512:5	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6 lines [1] - 1452:17 listed [4] - 1449:14,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17 machine [1] - 1439:15
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16 interrupted [1] - 1468:16 interrupting [1] -	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24, 1498:23, 1500:5,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] - 1473:13, 1506:14, 1512:4, 1512:5 large [2] - 1515:9,	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6 lines [1] - 1452:17 listed [4] - 1449:14, 1500:7, 1518:12,	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17 machine [1] - 1439:15 mail [1] - 1441:21
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16 interrupted [1] - 1468:16	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24, 1498:23, 1500:5, 1521:3	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] - 1473:13, 1506:14, 1512:4, 1512:5 large [2] - 1515:9, 1518:3	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6 lines [1] - 1452:17 listed [4] - 1449:14, 1500:7, 1518:12, 1520:5 lists [1] - 1497:23	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17 machine [1] - 1439:15 mail [1] - 1441:21 mailed [1] - 1441:14
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16 interrupted [1] - 1468:16 interrupting [1] -	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24, 1498:23, 1500:5, 1521:3 itself [10] - 1445:18,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] - 1473:13, 1506:14, 1512:4, 1512:5 large [2] - 1515:9, 1518:3 larger [1] - 1514:20 last [11] - 1441:21,	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6 lines [1] - 1452:17 listed [4] - 1449:14, 1500:7, 1518:12, 1520:5 lists [1] - 1497:23 litigated [1] - 1464:8	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17 machine [1] - 1439:15 mail [1] - 1441:21
1443:3 interpolated [2] - 1450:2, 1450:3 interpolation [5] - 1448:25, 1449:8, 1453:5, 1454:5, 1455:6 interpreted [1] - 1462:22 interrupt [2] - 1461:18, 1502:16 interrupted [1] - 1468:16 interrupting [1] - 1467:20	1463:20, 1466:13, 1471:25, 1472:3, 1472:14, 1476:13, 1497:9, 1506:24, 1516:11, 1518:1 issued [6] - 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:20, 1484:22, 1485:8 issues [3] - 1443:6, 1458:12, 1478:9 item [1] - 1514:1 items [4] - 1471:24, 1498:23, 1500:5, 1521:3 itself [10] - 1445:18, 1460:20, 1462:13,	1438:20, 1438:24 labeled [1] - 1447:18 Lack [1] - 1509:13 lack [1] - 1473:15 laid [1] - 1507:6 lands [4] - 1449:22, 1449:23, 1449:25, 1450:1 language [4] - 1473:13, 1506:14, 1512:4, 1512:5 large [2] - 1515:9, 1518:3 larger [1] - 1514:20	1468:3, 1468:14, 1485:10 line [11] - 1446:14, 1446:15, 1446:17, 1446:18, 1448:25, 1449:7, 1452:11, 1483:17, 1503:3, 1503:7 linear [3] - 1453:5, 1454:4, 1455:6 lines [1] - 1452:17 listed [4] - 1449:14, 1500:7, 1518:12, 1520:5 lists [1] - 1497:23	lower [6] - 1454:16, 1470:16, 1470:18, 1481:23, 1482:12, 1483:25 lunch [2] - 1521:16, 1521:18 MA [4] - 1451:20, 1451:22, 1476:3, 1476:17 machine [1] - 1439:15 mail [1] - 1441:21 mailed [1] - 1441:14

1473:18	1498:3, 1498:11,	1511:8, 1511:9,	1473:2, 1473:4,	1494:25, 1518:7
maintains [1] -	1501:6, 1508:20	1511:10, 1511:12,	1473:24, 1473:25,	needed [1] - 1441:12
1518:8	mind [1] - 1521:14	1511:13, 1511:14	1474:9, 1474:12,	needs [2] - 1517:21,
major [1] - 1443:2	mineral [6] -	monies [21] - 1452:5,	1477:12, 1477:15,	1517:23
majority [1] - 1503:8	1456:19, 1462:10,	1465:17, 1466:3,	1478:5, 1478:12,	negative [3] -
Management [2] -	1462:18, 1465:8,	1466:4, 1472:5,	1478:20, 1480:4,	1515:21, 1515:24,
1473:8, 1506:8	1465:11, 1465:15	1472:11, 1472:18,	1480:5, 1480:24,	1516:3
March [1] - 1467:5	Mineral [1] - 1462:12	1472:20, 1475:21,	1481:1, 1483:19,	negotiated [1] -
mark [8] - 1445:24,	minimum [3] -	1501:4, 1501:19,	1483:21, 1484:2,	1496:16
1447:22, 1451:10,	1517:21, 1517:23,	1501:21, 1501:23,	1484:4, 1486:1,	net [1] - 1511:25
1460:5, 1473:2,	1518:6	1503:11, 1510:3,	1486:3, 1487:11,	never [5] - 1466:8,
1477:12, 1478:15,	minimums [1] -	1510:6, 1511:4,	1487:12, 1489:21,	1466:23, 1496:14,
1489:21	1518:5	1519:14, 1519:22	1489:23, 1490:5,	1496:15, 1511:19
	minors [1] - 1466:16	Monies [2] - 1466:7,	1490:8, 1492:2,	
material [1] -		1477:17	1492:24, 1493:8,	new [9] - 1454:14,
1450:15	minus [5] - 1513:17,		1496:10, 1496:15,	1455:19, 1456:11,
materials [4] -	1515:11, 1518:22,	months [1] - 1463:14	1496:25, 1497:4,	1458:4, 1471:21,
1441:13, 1441:14,	1519:5, 1520:20	Morgan [9] -		1471:22, 1507:12,
1441:15, 1441:17	minute [1] - 1502:16	1450:10, 1452:22,	1497:8, 1497:12,	1507:15, 1507:17
matter [4] - 1463:9,	minutes [3] - 1441:8,	1453:3, 1454:12,	1497:16, 1498:8,	next [11] - 1453:4,
1511:18, 1511:22,	1468:19, 1505:15	1476:5, 1476:11,	1498:9, 1499:1,	1453:21, 1455:3,
1522:5	miscellaneous [1] -	1476:14, 1476:20	1499:13, 1499:19,	1458:6, 1478:2,
matters [2] -	1501:4	MORNING [1] -	1499:25, 1500:2,	1484:3, 1497:5,
1468:18, 1510:14	misread [1] -	1438:7	1500:18, 1500:20,	1499:22, 1500:4,
maximum [1] -	1492:24	morning [5] -	1501:2, 1501:12,	1500:23, 1506:13
1512:11	missing [16] -	1441:4, 1441:5,	1505:6, 1505:14,	night [1] - 1441:21
McCoy [1] - 1473:8	1447:20, 1447:21,	1441:15, 1442:7,	1505:16, 1505:23,	nine [1] - 1490:5
mean [10] - 1475:18,	1448:7, 1453:10,	1442:8	1506:3, 1506:4,	Ninth [1] - 1438:13
1476:19, 1479:10,	1453:17, 1454:5,	most [2] - 1445:1,	1507:5, 1507:8,	Nobody [1]
1479:13, 1487:16,	1473:14, 1474:19,	1466:5	1507:10, 1507:11,	1505:13
1491:5, 1498:4,	1474:20, 1475:4,	motion [12] - 1460:9,	1507:17, 1507:19,	nominal [15] -
1508:3, 1509:5,	1476:7, 1476:8,	1460:13, 1461:19,	1509:13, 1509:15,	1470:16, 1470:24,
1515:23	1476:16, 1502:22,	1461:22, 1461:24,	1509:20, 1512:2,	1508:19, 1508:25,
means [5] - 1458:15,	1504:23	1465:2, 1465:6,	1512:6, 1521:13,	1509:3, 1509:23,
1474:17, 1506:10,	MIT [2] - 1443:1,	1467:23, 1467:25,	1521:19	1510:15, 1513:11,
1506:18, 1506:23	1443:10	1468:7, 1468:14,	multiplied [2] -	1514:8, 1514:13,
,	model [18] - 1441:12,	1468:15	1488:8, 1490:16	1516:11, 1516:19,
members [4] -	1442:10, 1444:15,	moved [1] - 1468:3	multiplies [2] -	1516:23, 1517:16,
1461:12, 1463:1,		Moved [1] - 1440:8	1518:15, 1519:16	
1496:23, 1505:9	1444:18, 1444:20,	MR [110] - 1441:5,	,	1519:3
mention [1] -	1445:18, 1445:19,		Ν	NORC [4] - 1488:4,
1502:12	1446:8, 1447:14,	1441:9, 1442:5,		1488:8, 1488:12,
mentioned [4] -	1448:3, 1448:5,	1442:7, 1442:9,	N.W [3] - 1438:20,	1489:25
1449:21, 1478:7,	1450:5, 1454:8,	1442:14, 1442:25,	1439:4, 1439:13	North [1] - 1438:25
1483:11, 1490:3	1454:23, 1466:10,	1443:22, 1444:2,	narrative [1]	not-paid [1] -
Merrill [1] - 1462:2	1509:22, 1520:25	1444:8, 1444:16,	1483:16	1488:21
methodology [1] -	models [1] - 1441:21	1445:24, 1446:1,	narrow [1] - 1465:4	not [1] - 1521:12
1448:16	modifications [4] -	1447:22, 1447:24,	Nation [11] - 1462:4,	note [1] - 1500:8
Michael [1] - 1464:23	1442:11, 1445:16,	1450:18, 1450:21,	1465:2, 1465:3,	noticing [2] -
MICHAEL [1] -	1457:25	1451:10, 1451:12,	1465:6, 1465:14,	1500:14, 1504:10
1439:2	moment [1] - 1441:6	1452:13, 1452:16,	1467:2, 1467:11,	November [1] -
Michelle [3] - 1445:2,	Money [2] - 1465:24,	1452:24, 1452:25,	1467:12, 1467:24,	1477:18
•• •	1466:1	1456:4, 1456:6,	1468:7, 1468:9	NUMBER [1] -
1455:16, 1455:19	money [23] -	1458:10, 1458:11,	nearly [1] - 1512:16	1440:6
		1460:5, 1460:7,	necessarily [4] -	number [94] -
microphone [1] -	1466:17, 1466:20,	,,		
microphone [1] - 1444:11	1466:17, 1466:20,	1460:16, 1460:18,		1447:2 1447:4
microphone [1] - 1444:11 middle [3] - 1473:14,	1466:17, 1466:20, 1467:14, 1468:12,		1501:10, 1510:2,	1447:2, 1447:4, 1449:18, 1449:19
microphone [1] - 1444:11 middle [3] - 1473:14, 1517:10, 1517:13	1466:17, 1466:20, 1467:14, 1468:12, 1472:15, 1484:21,	1460:16, 1460:18,	1501:10, 1510:2, 1513:25, 1517:22	1449:18, 1449:19,
1444:11 middle [3] - 1473:14, 1517:10, 1517:13 might [4] - 1461:17,	1466:17, 1466:20, 1467:14, 1468:12, 1472:15, 1484:21, 1484:22, 1496:8,	1460:16, 1460:18, 1461:23, 1462:2,	1501:10, 1510:2, 1513:25, 1517:22 necessary [1] -	1449:18, 1449:19, 1450:9, 1450:10,
microphone [1] - 1444:11 middle [3] - 1473:14, 1517:10, 1517:13 might [4] - 1461:17, 1461:18, 1501:24,	1466:17, 1466:20, 1467:14, 1468:12, 1472:15, 1484:21, 1484:22, 1496:8, 1496:11, 1496:12,	1460:16, 1460:18, 1461:23, 1462:2, 1462:6, 1464:23, 1468:23, 1468:24,	1501:10, 1510:2, 1513:25, 1517:22 necessary [1] - 1505:17	1449:18, 1449:19, 1450:9, 1450:10, 1452:6, 1452:8,
microphone [1] - 1444:11 middle [3] - 1473:14, 1517:10, 1517:13 might [4] - 1461:17, 1461:18, 1501:24, 1521:13	1466:17, 1466:20, 1467:14, 1468:12, 1472:15, 1484:21, 1484:22, 1496:8, 1496:11, 1496:12, 1497:7, 1503:13,	1460:16, 1460:18, 1461:23, 1462:2, 1462:6, 1464:23, 1468:23, 1468:24, 1469:2, 1469:4,	1501:10, 1510:2, 1513:25, 1517:22 necessary [1] - 1505:17 need [8] - 1442:2,	1449:18, 1449:19, 1450:9, 1450:10, 1452:6, 1452:8, 1452:10, 1456:20,
microphone [1] - 1444:11 middle [3] - 1473:14, 1517:10, 1517:13 might [4] - 1461:17, 1461:18, 1501:24,	1466:17, 1466:20, 1467:14, 1468:12, 1472:15, 1484:21, 1484:22, 1496:8, 1496:11, 1496:12,	1460:16, 1460:18, 1461:23, 1462:2, 1462:6, 1464:23, 1468:23, 1468:24,	1501:10, 1510:2, 1513:25, 1517:22 necessary [1] - 1505:17	1449:18, 1449:19, 1450:9, 1450:10, 1452:6, 1452:8,

1				
1469:16, 1470:17,	1507:5, 1509:13	1459:19, 1460:2,	1509:17	Palmer [35] -
1472:21, 1477:10,	obligated [1] -	1460:13, 1460:21,	owner [1] - 1460:20	1442:12, 1442:17,
1482:8, 1482:10,	1443:18	1460:25, 1461:2,	owners [8] -	1442:19, 1442:23,
1482:11, 1482:22,	observed [3] -	1461:5, 1461:9,	1462:16, 1462:19,	1442:25, 1443:11,
1482:23, 1483:2,	1452:11, 1493:6,	1463:4, 1463:15,	1465:10, 1465:13,	1443:20, 1444:9,
1484:15, 1484:18,	1495:10	1463:18, 1469:13	1465:16, 1467:6,	1444:24, 1446:4,
1485:9, 1485:15,	obtain [1] - 1485:6	opinion [1] - 1443:23	1467:11, 1467:13	1447:11, 1447:25,
1485:18, 1486:8,	obtained [3] -	opinions [1] - 1507:7		1451:13, 1452:17,
1486:12, 1486:25,	1457:18, 1485:6,	opportune [1] -	Р	1454:22, 1460:8,
1487:3, 1488:5,	1521:1	1461:18		1463:3, 1464:21,
1488:7, 1488:8,	occurred [2] -	opportunity [1] -	p.m [3] - 1441:18,	1467:20, 1468:25,
1488:17, 1488:24,	1470:3, 1512:18	1517:19	1441:21, 1521:21	1473:10, 1474:13,
1488:25, 1489:1,	October [3] -	oppose [2] - 1462:8	P.O _[1] - 1439:9	1481:2, 1484:5,
1490:2, 1490:3,	1455:14, 1490:11,	opposed [4] -	PACER [6] - 1483:1,	1489:24, 1491:17,
1490:10, 1491:17,	1490:13	1467:8, 1487:22,	1488:1, 1488:6,	1497:14, 1497:17,
1493:20, 1493:24,	OF [5] - 1438:1,	1502:3	1488:12, 1490:4,	1505:3, 1505:17,
1494:6, 1494:7,	1438:8, 1438:12,	order [4] - 1464:10,	1490:12	1506:6, 1507:7,
1494:15, 1494:23,	1522:1, 1522:10	1465:20, 1487:3,	Page [2] - 1443:7,	1512:7, 1512:15,
1495:2, 1495:4,	OFF [1] - 1462:5	1518:1	1520:1	1516:20
1495:14, 1495:23,	offer [2] - 1443:20,	organizational [1] -	page [55] - 1450:19,	Palmer's [2] -
1496:3, 1497:23,	1507:7	1465:17	1457:8, 1457:13,	1442:2, 1443:24
1498:4, 1498:5,	offered [1] - 1443:11	orient [1] - 1497:10	1460:15, 1460:17,	papers [1] - 1468:1
1498:10, 1503:1,	Office [2] - 1499:5,	original [7] - 1450:5,	1465:7, 1470:8,	paragraph [4] -
1503:3, 1503:7,	1506:7	1461:11, 1478:23,	1470:10, 1470:20, 1471:3, 1471:5,	1477:22, 1490:6,
1504:15, 1504:25,	OFFICES [1] -	1511:10, 1512:24,		1500:24, 1501:3
1505:2, 1505:3,	1438:12	1520:17, 1521:9	1473:9, 1477:20, 1477:22, 1478:1,	part [7] - 1441:16,
1505:4, 1505:5,	OFFICIAL [1] -	originally [1] -	1477.22, 1478.1, 1478:2, 1478:13,	1466:5, 1466:9,
1505:7, 1505:8,	1522:1	1444:21	1478:14, 1478:21,	1466:24, 1468:9,
1509:7, 1509:8,	Official [1] - 1439:12	Osage [41] - 1447:8,	1478:22, 1478:23,	1511:24, 1515:3
1513:11, 1513:14,	offset [2] - 1510:8,	1447:17, 1458:14,	1478:24, 1484:3,	particular [8] -
1514:6, 1514:11,	1514:2	1458:16, 1458:18,	1485:3, 1485:14,	1463:4, 1477:5,
1514:16, 1514:20, 1514:24, 1515:7,	offsets [1] - 1520:16	1459:11, 1460:2,	1485:16, 1485:17,	1485:10, 1499:18,
1515:21, 1520:17,	often [2] - 1472:17,	1460:23, 1461:21,	1486:2, 1486:19,	1502:23, 1504:19,
1520:22, 1521:4,	1504:11	1462:1, 1462:3,	1490:5, 1490:7,	1505:11, 1519:1
1521:9	oftentimes [1] -	1462:8, 1462:11,	1499:6, 1499:7,	parties [1] - 1496:6
numbers [28] -	1502:25	1462:12, 1464:11,	1499:8, 1499:11,	parts [1] - 1506:22
1446:11, 1446:16,	once [4] - 1466:20,	1465:2, 1465:3,	1499:16, 1499:18,	party [1] - 1468:6 past [1] - 1462:21
1447:4, 1448:3,	1509:19, 1516:14,	1465:5, 1465:8,	1499:19, 1499:22,	-
1449:24, 1454:16,	1520:15	1465:9, 1465:11,	1500:4, 1500:19,	pause [1] - 1501:25
1469:10, 1475:14,	Once [1] - 1452:8	1465:13, 1465:14,	1500:21, 1500:23,	pay [1] - 1443:18
1475:24, 1481:13,	one [35] - 1450:3,	1466:5, 1466:13, 1467:2, 1467:7,	1506:9, 1506:13,	payment [2] -
1481:23, 1483:12,	1454:15, 1459:18,	1467:11, 1467:12,	1506:14, 1508:17,	1489:25, 1512:9
1484:16, 1487:4,	1459:19, 1460:2,	1467:24, 1467:25,	1512:3, 1515:5,	payments [5] - 1466:14, 1466:23,
1487:5, 1491:18,	1460:13, 1460:19, 1460:21, 1460:25	1468:7, 1468:9,	1516:18, 1520:1,	1400:14, 1400:23, 1490:14,
1492:5, 1492:7,	1460:21, 1460:25,	1468:12, 1469:5,	1520:6, 1520:7	1513:18
1494:9, 1494:18,	1461:2, 1461:5, 1461:9, 1462:9	1469:10, 1470:1,	paid [26] - 1451:3,	Peachtree [1] -
1494:20, 1502:3,	1461:9, 1462:9, 1462:15, 1463:4	1470:4, 1470:12	1466:4, 1466:6,	1438:16
1502:19, 1504:17,	1462:15, 1463:4, 1463:15, 1463:18,	outflows [3] -	1466:14, 1482:10,	people [3] - 1466:16,
1508:12, 1508:14,	1469:11, 1469:13,	1498:6, 1508:16,	1482:15, 1482:18,	1466:22, 1518:7
1509:5, 1520:10	1409.11, 1409.13, 1471:24,	1515:12	1484:10, 1484:11,	PEPION [1] - 1438:2
NW [1] - 1438:12	1472:24, 1474:22,	outlier [1] - 1453:15	1488:20, 1488:21,	per [2] - 1487:4,
	1475:10, 1476:6,	output [1] - 1446:7	1488:23, 1489:6,	1488:7
0	1480:2, 1482:6,	outside [1] - 1511:20	1489:11, 1495:25,	percent [33] -
Oath [1] - 1442:13	1492:17, 1492:21,	overall [1] - 1467:17	1496:12, 1496:14,	1452:7, 1452:21,
object [1] - 1443:23	1492:22, 1500:5,	overnight [1] -	1496:15, 1501:5,	1459:18, 1459:19,
objection [1] -	1500:16, 1504:7	1518:5	1501:10, 1504:25, 1505:1, 1513:2,	1460:2, 1460:13,
1465:3	One [1] - 1454:6	overreporting [1] -	1505.1, 1513.2, 1519:7	1461:1, 1461:2,
Objection [4] -	one-and-a-quarter	1482:2	PALMER [2] -	1461:5, 1469:13,
1473:24, 1478:5,	[13] - 1459:18,	Overruled [1] -	1440:3, 1444:5	1472:22, 1472:24,
			. + + 0.0, 1 + + + .0	
1				

t	i	i	i	i
1479:17, 1482:17,	pick [1] - 1517:2	possibility [1] -	1466:16	pull [1] - 1499:9
1485:23, 1491:18,	pieces [3] - 1503:5,	1466:2	Printing [1] - 1499:5	purchase [6] -
1492:17, 1492:21,	1520:24, 1521:1	possible [3] -	problems [1] -	1500:11, 1501:6,
1492:22, 1492:23,	place [1] - 1466:9	1464:3, 1471:18,	1500:1	1502:19, 1503:9,
1493:22, 1493:23,	Plaintiff [1] - 1489:22	1514:16	procedure [5] -	1503:14, 1504:2
1494:5, 1494:10,	plaintiff [1] - 1466:25	posted [1] - 1490:11	1446:11, 1448:24,	purchases [1] -
1494:18, 1495:1,	PLAINTIFF [1] -	postpone [1] -	1453:2, 1453:10,	1503:24
1495:3, 1495:23,	1444:5	1442:22	1455:22	purchasing [4] -
1495:24, 1510:18,	plaintiffs [11] -	potential [3] -	proceed [1] - 1444:1	1500:9, 1501:7,
1519:10	1441:11, 1442:12,	1513:20, 1513:25,	Proceed [2] -	1501:14, 1502:12
percentage [5] -	1443:11, 1443:18,	1518:24	1468:21, 1484:14	purpose [5] -
1463:13, 1482:21,	1443:20, 1449:14,	powerfully [2] -	proceeding [8] -	1443:21, 1465:3,
1491:10, 1492:12,	1461:21, 1465:8,	1495:19, 1495:21	1445:11, 1449:12,	1465:4, 1468:3,
1495:9	1465:11, 1466:10,	precise [2] -	1455:15, 1459:23,	1468:14
percentages [2] -	1466:12	1472:25, 1474:5	1463:23, 1464:13,	purposes [4] -
1472:24, 1474:5	Plaintiffs [15] -	precisely [3] -	1464:17, 1471:20	1463:22, 1478:12,
performed [1] -	1438:3, 1438:11,	1448:4, 1474:4,	Proceedings [1] -	1504:24, 1505:24
1448:5	1444:2, 1445:24,	1474:25	1439:15	put [10] - 1442:14,
Period [2] - 1449:19,	1447:22, 1465:18,	precluded [1] -	proceedings [1] -	1452:13, 1454:2,
1450:10	1473:2, 1473:9,	1442:22	1522:4	1457:19, 1465:22,
period [55] - 1447:5,	1474:9, 1477:12,	prepare [7] -	proceeds [5] -	1469:2, 1496:17,
1448:10, 1448:12,	1478:15, 1489:21,	1444:17, 1446:4,	1451:2, 1462:9,	1498:13, 1510:16,
1448:21, 1448:22,	1499:1, 1506:1,	1474:13, 1481:2,	1462:18, 1503:23,	1510:17
1448:23, 1449:3,	1512:2	1498:14, 1498:16	1510:15	PX-189-C [1] -
1449:4, 1449:5,	Plaintiffs' [13] -	prepared [8] -	produced [1] -	1480:25
1449:6, 1449:9,	1442:15, 1447:10,	1444:21, 1448:1,	1439:15	PX-83 [1] - 1473:9
1449:13, 1449:15,	1452:24, 1456:5,	1450:12, 1461:22,	Professor [4] -	PX-92 [2] - 1499:9,
1449:18, 1450:9,	1458:7, 1460:6,	1461:24, 1488:4,	1442:20, 1444:10,	1500:18
1450:16, 1450:17,	1471:3, 1474:11,	1490:23, 1498:15	1444:13, 1517:4	
1453:1, 1453:5,	1477:16, 1480:6,	preparing [1] -	prohibited [1] -	Q
1453:9, 1455:3,	1497:15, 1499:9,	1462:7	1512:9	Q&A [1] - 1461:18
1456:16, 1457:9,	1508:12	present [2] -	properly [1] -	qualified [2] -
1465:18, 1471:14,	plaintiffs' [4] -	1462:21, 1465:23	1505:20	1455:10, 1456:1
1474:23, 1474:24, 1475:1, 1475:10,	1462:23, 1466:25,	presentation [1] -	property [3] -	quantify [1] -
1475:11, 1475:10,	1481:23, 1496:11	1468:10	1443:5, 1462:19,	1479:16
1476:14, 1476:23,	planning [1] -	presented [5] -	1465:9	quantitative [2] -
1476:24, 1476:25,	1483:19	1444:13, 1447:2,	protected [2] -	1443:4, 1479:14
1479:21, 1480:10,	plotted [1] - 1446:9	1459:22, 1473:23,	1463:18, 1464:16	quarter [13] -
1480:13, 1480:14,	plus [7] - 1463:15, 1511:9, 1511:11,	1474:1	protecting [1] -	1459:18, 1459:19,
1480:19, 1480:20,	1511.9, 1511.11, 1512:24, 1513:7,	preserving [1] - 1443:22	1467:16	1460:2, 1460:13,
1480:22, 1481:21,	1512:24, 1513:7, 1519:20		prototype [1] -	1460:21, 1460:25,
1485:10, 1490:15,	point [13] - 1451:9,	presumably [1] - 1503:23	1489:25 provide [7] -	1461:2, 1461:5,
1501:18, 1502:7,	1453:4, 1453:6,			1461:9, 1463:4,
1502:14, 1513:4,	1453:12, 1453:21,	pretty [1] - 1480:1 previous [10] -	1441:11, 1442:16, 1449:16, 1453:13,	1463:15, 1463:18,
1516:23, 1517:7,	1456:12, 1467:22,	1487:17, 1499:19,	1449.16, 1453.13, 1458:14, 1467:4,	1469:13
1517:13, 1520:15	1472:11, 1503:22,	1515:17, 1518:14,	1472:19	Quinn [2] - 1464:22,
periods [18] -	1505:24, 1510:12,	1518:16, 1518:21,	provided [20] -	1464:23
1448:1, 1448:13,	1513:8, 1514:24	1519:10, 1519:11,	1449:7, 1449:11,	QUINN [2] - 1439:2,
1448:15, 1448:18,	pointed [2] -	1519:19	1450:11, 1454:19,	1464:23
1449:13, 1453:2,	1472:23, 1482:9	previously [12] -	1455:4, 1455:9,	quite [1] - 1446:22
1457:8, 1457:21,	points [2] - 1454:5,	1445:22, 1449:22,	1457:16, 1469:18,	quote [1] - 1465:12
1474:17, 1474:18,	1454:15	1467:9, 1469:25,	1469:20, 1472:21,	
1474:20, 1474:22,	pool [2] - 1463:4,	1471:12, 1471:23,	1475:6, 1475:8,	R
1475:2, 1475:5,	1463:14	1475:6, 1482:6,	1476:6, 1483:1,	raised [1] - 1477:6
1475:7, 1475:15,	position [8] -	1483:1, 1484:1,	1484:13, 1486:24,	rate [50] - 1454:1,
1481:18, 1500:17	1461:21, 1462:23,	1517:5	1487:19, 1490:13,	1454:20, 1474:22,
permissive [2] -	1464:12, 1465:1,	Previously [1] -	1502:3, 1517:15	1477:1, 1480:10,
1468:5, 1468:8	1465:25, 1467:14,	1471:13	public [3] - 1506:19,	1480:13, 1481:14,
Ph.D [1] - 1442:25	1467:15, 1496:11	primarily [1] -	1506:21, 1506:22	1481:20, 1481:22,

		-		
1483:9, 1492:9,	received [10] -	1517:11	1502:10, 1502:13,	1457:18, 1457:24,
1492:11, 1492:14,	1447:19, 1458:5,	reflects [2] -	1503:1, 1520:11,	1467:18, 1469:10,
1492:17, 1492:21,	1466:23, 1471:13,	1491:13, 1519:5	1520:12, 1520:21	1470:4, 1481:13,
1493:3, 1493:5,	1471:22, 1482:25,	refresh [2] - 1500:3,	REPORTER [2] -	1492:7, 1493:2,
1493:6, 1493:10,	1491:1, 1510:23,	1521:15	1522:1, 1522:10	1509:7, 1513:17
1493:12, 1494:1,	1513:19, 1521:1	regard [18] -	Reporter [2] -	revenues [33] -
1494:2, 1494:5,	receiving [2] -	1446:20, 1450:9,	1439:11, 1439:12	1446:3, 1446:10,
1495:4, 1495:18,	1467:13, 1519:22	1455:7, 1457:1,	reports [3] - 1451:1,	1446:18, 1446:22,
1496:1, 1509:1,	recess [2] - 1468:17,	1460:23, 1463:16,	1475:19, 1499:2	1447:16, 1448:2,
1509:25, 1510:18,	1468:18	1464:4, 1469:10,	represent [2] -	1448:15, 1448:19,
1516:25, 1517:2,	Recess [2] -	1470:3, 1470:19,	1467:15, 1508:16	1449:25, 1450:16,
1517:3, 1517:4,	1468:20, 1521:21	1470:23, 1471:10,	Representatives [1]	1450:17, 1452:8,
1517:5, 1517:6,	recognize [2]	1473:1, 1489:16,	- 1499:11	1455:8, 1456:7,
1517:9, 1517:11,	1447:25, 1460:8	1492:11, 1492:17,	represented [4] -	1457:14, 1457:15,
1517:16, 1517:18,	recollection [3] -	1496:20	1464:20, 1466:25,	1459:13, 1470:6,
1518:2, 1518:9,	1459:25, 1500:3,	regarding [2] -	1467:1, 1467:9	1470:7, 1470:20,
1518:15, 1518:18,	1521:15	1479:11, 1498:22	representing [2] -	1470:23, 1483:8,
1518:25, 1519:8,	reconciled [1] -	regardless [2] -	1462:1, 1467:6	1492:3, 1493:18,
1519:9, 1519:16	1473:18	1466:3, 1466:9	required [1] -	1493:21, 1499:17,
rates [4] - 1481:16,	record [3] - 1467:24,	regards [1] - 1489:19	1496:23	1509:7, 1511:6,
1512:11, 1517:13,	1478:12, 1522:4	region [1] - 1489:25	Reserve [1] -	1515:14, 1515:25,
1518:5	RECORD [1] -	relate [1] - 1457:15	1512:11	1518:22, 1519:5,
ratio [19] - 1452:9,	1462:5	related [5] - 1443:6,	reside [1] - 1511:18	1519:20
1479:24, 1479:25,	recorded [1] -	1451:17, 1452:3,	resides [2] - 1510:11	review [7] - 1443:13,
1480:1, 1480:2,	1506:18	1471:24	residual [1] -	1445:10, 1445:13,
1480:17, 1480:21,	records [2] -	relates [1] - 1457:21	1482:12	1451:7, 1460:3,
1481:25, 1482:4,	1473:14, 1485:9	relating [1] - 1505:7	resolution [1] -	1489:6, 1502:5
1483:11, 1491:9,	RECROSS [1] -	relation [1] - 1506:25	1462:13	reviewed [10] -
1492:9, 1492:15,	1440:2	relationship [1] -	respect [14] -	1456:12, 1472:16,
1493:16, 1493:23,	red [2] - 1446:14,	1466:17	1450:24, 1453:1,	1472:17, 1485:1,
1494:21, 1494:22,	1446:15	relied [4] - 1460:22,	1465:1, 1465:5,	1488:11, 1490:1,
1500:16, 1502:2 read [8] - 1451:14,	redeemed [1] -	1474:23, 1475:23,	1465:17, 1467:12,	1490:9, 1491:7,
1451:17, 1452:20,	1503:21	1487:24	1471:19, 1475:16,	1498:22, 1499:14 reviewing [1] -
1461:11, 1473:11,	redemption [2] -	rely [1] - 1487:7	1476:3, 1477:2,	1478:2
1477:24, 1478:25,	1503:16, 1504:1	remainder [1] -	1480:6, 1491:15,	revised [2] -
1479:2	REDIRECT [1] -	1505:8	1492:3, 1516:19	1441:22, 1444:15
really [9] - 1455:23,	1440:2	remained [1] -	responded [1] -	right-hand [2] -
1472:13, 1472:25,	reduce [1] - 1516:7	1496:13	1467:21	1498:11, 1520:8
1474:5, 1483:6,	reduced [4] -	remember [6] -	responding [1] -	rights [3] - 1443:23,
1495:1, 1510:14,	1455:20, 1460:24,	1458:3, 1470:17,	1464:25	1456:19, 1462:18
1511:1, 1511:18	1461:4, 1516:2	1474:3, 1521:9,	responsibilities [1] -	road [2] - 1517:10,
reason [3] - 1489:4,	reduction [1] -	1521:10, 1521:11	1465:14	1517:14
1507:20, 1517:8	1469:12	repeated [1] -	rest [1] - 1453:14	ROBERT [1] - 1439:1
reasons [3] - 1462:9,	refer [1] - 1447:14	1463:23	restate [1] - 1469:9	ROBERTSON [1] -
1500:16, 1508:15	reference [1] - 1452:17	report [6] - 1455:10, 1473:11, 1477:16,	result [7] - 1457:25, 1458:2, 1463:12,	1438:9
Rebecca [1] - 1522:3				role [1] - 1467:16
REBECCA [1] -	referenced [2] - 1451:7, 1464:21	1478:16, 1488:4, 1499:9	1469:22, 1470:3, 1470:15, 1512:15	Room [1] - 1439:12
1439:11		reported [28] -	return [1] - 1498:19	roughly [1] - 1497:22
receipt [4] - 1447:2,	referring [2] - 1450:23, 1450:24	1439:15, 1448:6,	returned [9] -	rounded [1] -
1466:16, 1504:2,	reflect [4] - 1449:3,	1449:4, 1449:8,	1496:8, 1510:13,	1485:17
1504:7	1485:7, 1508:13,	1451:23, 1453:22,	1511:19, 1512:17,	row [1] - 1520:1
Receipts [1] -	1515:9	1456:14, 1456:22,	1514:4, 1514:5,	royalties [1]
1499:22	reflected [9] -	1471:16, 1473:7,	1514:14, 1514:17,	1465:12
receipts [8] - 1451:4,	1446:21, 1456:8,	1474:20, 1475:14,	1514:19	rules [1] - 1464:2
1451:5, 1475:20,	1485:16, 1486:9,	1475:19, 1476:1,	revenue [19] -	run [1] - 1454:1
1492:18, 1492:21,	1487:6, 1505:20,	1478:11, 1479:7,	1447:2, 1447:12,	
1499:24, 1504:4,	1506:21, 1506:22,	1479:23, 1481:20,	1447:14, 1447:15,	S
1504:5	1515:10	1493:3, 1493:5,	1447:16, 1447:17,	
receive [1] - 1466:3	reflective [1] -	1495:6, 1502:1,	1456:13, 1456:22,	Salem [1] - 1438:25

i	i	i	1	i
sanity [1] - 1452:10	1506:11, 1508:18,	1453:2, 1473:9	1473:7	1515:1, 1516:6,
sat [4] - 1471:19,	1514:11, 1515:21,	slippage [1] - 1441:7	states [1] - 1512:9	1520:15
1511:20, 1517:23,	1516:20	smaller [1] - 1472:24	States [10] - 1460:14,	subtracted [9] -
1517:24	seeking [4] - 1464:1,	SMITH [1] - 1438:23	1462:15, 1464:24,	1454:21, 1459:14,
Saturday [1] -	1464:13, 1464:14	smooth [1] - 1488:10	1465:11, 1467:7,	1510:4, 1510:7,
1441:13	sell [1] - 1483:16	so [1] - 1441:8	1477:17, 1477:19,	1511:17, 1511:21,
savings [3] -	Senior [1] - 1439:6	solely [1] - 1505:7	1478:17, 1478:19,	1513:6, 1513:24,
1501:14, 1504:18,	separate [5] -	sometimes [3] -	1506:7	1515:4
1505:1	1462:14, 1472:4,	1447:19, 1471:16,	STATES [2] - 1438:1,	subtracting [4] -
saw [1] - 1486:11	1474:6, 1488:3,	1501:24	1438:9	1511:25, 1514:1,
scale [1] - 1451:25	1506:22	Sometimes [1] -	States' [1] - 1465:25	1516:9, 1520:13
scan [1] - 1441:12	separation [1] -	1447:20	States's [1] - 1465:1	subtraction [1] -
Schedule [5] -	1509:18	somewhat [2] -	Station [1] - 1439:8	1513:22
1479:19, 1480:18,	September [2] -	1472:2, 1476:24	statistics [4] -	subtracts [2] -
1480:24, 1487:9,	1490:1, 1520:11	soon [1] - 1472:6	1443:4, 1443:8,	1454:25, 1513:1
1480.24, 1487.9, 1487:11	series [1] - 1517:6		1443:10, 1443:12	succeeded [1] -
schedule [1] -	SESSION [1] -	sorry [7] - 1451:13,	statute [6] - 1451:11,	1467:19
	1438:7	1458:22, 1461:17,	•••	sufficiently [1] -
1441:7 scheduling [1] -	set [7] - 1441:15,	1480:2, 1492:19,	1451:14, 1451:16, 1462:10, 1462:17,	1518:3
••••	Set [7] - 1441:15, 1441:16, 1441:17,	1508:20, 1514:7	1462.10, 1462.17, 1464:19	Suite [2] - 1438:17,
1442:22 Scheuren [6] -	1441:16, 1441:17, 1461:13,	Sorry [2] - 1474:1,	STEMPLEWICZ [1] -	1438:21
		1492:24		
1445:8, 1447:1,	1512:11	sort [1] - 1468:2	1439:6 still [9] - 1463:7,	sum [1] - 1491:22
1447:9, 1453:14,	seven [3] - 1448:15,	sought [1] - 1467:6		summary [1] - 1477:23
1453:18, 1453:20	1453:1, 1484:2	source [8] - 1460:12,	1500:12, 1500:13,	
Scheuren's [3] -	several [9] - 1454:1,	1473:18, 1484:11,	1501:7, 1503:14,	Sunday [2] -
1446:3, 1446:8,	1454:3, 1462:9,	1484:12, 1486:7,	1503:15, 1508:1,	1441:15, 1441:18
1446:15	1464:6, 1464:16,	1487:9, 1490:2,	1508:8	supplied [1] - 1476:7
School [1] - 1443:8	1474:18, 1520:24,	1498:12	STOCKTON [3] -	suppose [1] -
scope [1] - 1507:6	1520:25, 1521:11	sources [2] - 1451:2,	1438:16, 1438:20,	1496:21
screen [5] - 1442:14,	share [1] - 1469:14	1488:11	1438:24	supposed [2] -
1452:14, 1458:8,	shares [4] - 1459:5,	speaking [1] -	STONESTREET [1] -	1472:11, 1492:20
1465:22, 1474:10	1459:6, 1459:12,	1446:20	1439:11	surplus [1] - 1506:10
seat [1] - 1507:16	1469:16	specializes [1] -	Stonestreet [1] -	surrounding [1] -
second [6] -	shorthand [1] -	1443:3	1522:3	1474:22
1441:16, 1441:17,	1439:15	specific [7] -	straight [3] -	sworn [1] - 1444:5
1449:3, 1449:4,	show [1] - 1448:1	1494:13, 1494:19,	1448:25, 1449:7,	system [7] - 1466:8,
1485:14, 1515:5	showed [2] -	1497:20, 1500:5,	1495:9	1466:15, 1490:12,
Secondly [1] -	1498:16, 1504:25	1502:3, 1504:9,	Strauss [1] - 1462:3	1495:25, 1501:19,
1462:12	Showing [1] -	1504:13	Street [5] - 1438:12,	1504:6, 1504:7
seconds [1] -	1502:24	specifically [5] -	1438:16, 1438:20,	
1461:23	showing [2] -	1465:4, 1492:1,	1438:24, 1439:4	Т
Secretary [1] -	1497:20, 1502:24	1502:7, 1516:14,	subject [3] -	table (5) 1/96.7
1438:5	shows [1] - 1487:2	1516:17	1442:11, 1443:22,	table [5] - 1486:7, 1486:9, 1486:10,
section [6] -	side [2] - 1477:21,	spent [1] - 1441:19	1471:16	1486:9, 1486:10, 1486:17, 1486:20
1451:14, 1460:17,	1520:8	spread [1] - 1490:17	submit [1] - 1467:1	
1473:11, 1474:11,	SIGNATURE [1] -	stage [1] - 1468:11	subquestions [1] -	tables [2] - 1486:24, 1487:2
1499:21, 1506:14	1522:10	stages [1] - 1467:17	1496:22	
sections [1] -	signify [1] - 1476:3	stamps [5] - 1500:7,	subsequently [3] -	talks [4] - 1456:10,
1499:23	similar [2] - 1446:22,	1500:10, 1501:14,	1444:22, 1455:9,	1499:17, 1500:4,
securities [1] -	1505:8	1504:18, 1505:2	1487:19	1500:5
1507:21	simple [1] - 1464:18	standing [1] -	subset [2] - 1504:21,	TAYLOR [1] -
	sit [3] - 1444:24,	1466:24	1505:10	1438:23
see [23] - 1446:12,			substantially [1] -	teacher [1] - 1443:8
see [23] - 1446:12, 1448:6, 1448:14,	1503:17, 1514:21	start [2] - 1475:10,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
		start [2] - 1475:10, 1501:20	1453:14	technological [1] -
1448:6, 1448:14,	1503:17, 1514:21			1499:25
1448:6, 1448:14, 1452:10, 1452:18,	1503:17, 1514:21 sits [1] - 1503:15	1501:20	1453:14	1499:25 terms [14] - 1447:7,
1448:6, 1448:14, 1452:10, 1452:18, 1470:12, 1480:19,	1503:17, 1514:21 sits [1] - 1503:15 sitting [4] - 1442:23,	1501:20 starting [2] - 1449:1, 1455:4	1453:14 substitute [2] -	1499:25 terms [14] - 1447:7, 1454:25, 1467:17,
1448:6, 1448:14, 1452:10, 1452:18, 1470:12, 1480:19, 1481:23, 1482:16,	1503:17, 1514:21 sits [1] - 1503:15 sitting [4] - 1442:23, 1455:2, 1514:25, 1515:1	1501:20 starting [2] - 1449:1, 1455:4 state [2] - 1442:17,	1453:14 substitute [2] - 1505:4, 1505:5	1499:25 terms [14] - 1447:7, 1454:25, 1467:17, 1470:24, 1476:11,
1448:6, 1448:14, 1452:10, 1452:18, 1470:12, 1480:19, 1481:23, 1482:16, 1485:18, 1491:7,	1503:17, 1514:21 sits [1] - 1503:15 sitting [4] - 1442:23, 1455:2, 1514:25, 1515:1 situation [1] - 1441:6	1501:20 starting [2] - 1449:1, 1455:4 state [2] - 1442:17, 1449:10	1453:14 substitute [2] - 1505:4, 1505:5 Subtract [1] - 1509:8	1499:25 terms [14] - 1447:7, 1454:25, 1467:17, 1470:24, 1476:11, 1479:21, 1482:18,
1448:6, 1448:14, 1452:10, 1452:18, 1470:12, 1480:19, 1481:23, 1482:16, 1485:18, 1491:7, 1494:4, 1494:17,	1503:17, 1514:21 sits [1] - 1503:15 sitting [4] - 1442:23, 1455:2, 1514:25, 1515:1 situation [1] - 1441:6 six [5] - 1448:15,	1501:20 starting [2] - 1449:1, 1455:4 state [2] - 1442:17, 1449:10 statement [3] -	1453:14 substitute [2] - 1505:4, 1505:5 Subtract [1] - 1509:8 subtract [7] -	1499:25 terms [14] - 1447:7, 1454:25, 1467:17, 1470:24, 1476:11,
1448:6, 1448:14, 1452:10, 1452:18, 1470:12, 1480:19, 1481:23, 1482:16, 1485:18, 1491:7, 1494:4, 1494:17, 1494:21, 1498:10,	1503:17, 1514:21 sits [1] - 1503:15 sitting [4] - 1442:23, 1455:2, 1514:25, 1515:1 situation [1] - 1441:6	1501:20 starting [2] - 1449:1, 1455:4 state [2] - 1442:17, 1449:10	1453:14 substitute [2] - 1505:4, 1505:5 Subtract [1] - 1509:8 subtract [7] - 1454:22, 1472:12,	1499:25 terms [14] - 1447:7, 1454:25, 1467:17, 1470:24, 1476:11, 1479:21, 1482:18,

·	1	1		1
1497:25, 1498:1,	1521:20	totals [2] - 1454:25,	1473:6, 1473:15,	try [1] - 1456:20
1511:15, 1511:24,	themselves [2] -	1470:12	1473:17	trying [4] - 1458:3,
1511:13, 1511:24,	1454:16, 1463:11	trail [2] - 1473:15,	tribal [4] - 1460:1,	1469:16, 1481:6,
testified [8] - 1444:6,	theory [1] - 1496:22	1477:8	1466:4, 1469:13,	1409.10, 1401.0, 1507:2
			, ,	
1444:18, 1450:14,	therefore [4] -	transaction [1] -	1472:10	Tuesday [1] - 1438:4
1451:16, 1459:6,	1473:17, 1479:6,	1488:7	tribe [21] - 1459:20,	Tufts [1] - 1443:9
1463:3, 1470:14,	1508:7, 1520:14	transactions [4] -	1460:20, 1461:9,	turn [15] - 1460:15,
1487:18	third [1] - 1449:6	1473:15, 1473:17,	1461:13, 1462:8,	1470:8, 1473:9,
testifying [3] -	three [3] - 1457:13,	1488:6, 1488:8	1462:12, 1463:1,	1477:20, 1478:21,
1442:17, 1442:19,	1465:7, 1488:9	TRANSCRIPT [1] -	1463:2, 1463:12,	1485:12, 1490:5,
1442:21	three-year [1] -	1438:8	1463:16, 1463:18,	1499:6, 1499:7,
testimony [22] -	1488:9	transcript [2] -	1464:1, 1464:5,	1499:8, 1499:11,
1443:13, 1443:14,	throughout [5] -	1439:15, 1522:4	1464:7, 1464:11,	1506:8, 1506:13,
1443:24, 1445:2,	1457:13, 1461:2,	transcription [1] -	1464:13, 1464:14,	1508:17, 1512:3
1445:4, 1445:6,	1465:25, 1471:15,	1439:16	1466:19, 1467:9,	two [26] - 1443:7,
1445:8, 1445:13,	1473:15	transfer [5] -	1467:17	1452:17, 1454:5,
1450:8, 1451:5,	Thursday [2] -	1480:23, 1491:22,	tribes [2] - 1505:8,	1457:8, 1457:13,
1459:11, 1468:17,	1441:10, 1473:6	1495:17, 1498:2,	1505:9	1462:14, 1468:17,
1469:20, 1469:23,	timber [1] - 1456:19	1501:22	tried [6] - 1451:25,	1469:11, 1471:20,
1473:5, 1473:22,	title [2] - 1462:25,	transferred [3] -	1456:14, 1456:20,	1472:24, 1473:21,
1473:23, 1474:1,	1463:10	1483:3, 1487:21,	1459:11, 1471:15,	1475:3, 1477:1,
1474:3, 1506:6,			1471:17	1484:16, 1484:21,
1517:6, 1521:2	today [5] - 1441:24,	1512:13		1486:23, 1486:24,
textbook [1] -	1441:25, 1442:18,	transfers [9] -	true [1] - 1496:1	
1483:16	1466:11, 1467:4	1472:7, 1480:12,	trumps [1] - 1464:10	1487:2, 1487:23,
	together [3] -	1481:10, 1482:24,	trust [9] - 1443:5,	1489:1, 1491:24,
THE [70] - 1438:1,	1444:19, 1486:24,	1483:5, 1487:17,	1462:24, 1463:7,	1492:10, 1493:2,
1438:9, 1441:4,	1491:24	1489:12, 1489:17,	1465:12, 1507:3,	1496:21, 1501:10,
1441:8, 1442:4,	took [16] - 1446:7,	1490:4	1507:4, 1507:21,	1520:10
1442:6, 1442:8,	1447:18, 1449:24,	Treasury [36] -	1520:11, 1520:21	type [2] - 1482:2,
1442:24, 1444:1,	1450:8, 1453:3,	1451:3, 1454:20,	Trust [61] - 1443:15,	1486:23
1444:11, 1458:8,	1459:13, 1459:14,	1463:5, 1463:6,	1443:16, 1447:12,	
1461:17, 1462:1,	1475:2, 1475:13,	1463:14, 1465:13,	1452:5, 1455:2,	U
1462:5, 1464:22,	1476:23, 1476:25,	1509:1, 1509:12,	1456:15, 1458:19,	
1467:19, 1468:21,	1488:7, 1489:10,	1509:24, 1510:13,	1458:24, 1459:4,	U.S [6] - 1439:3,
1478:6, 1479:10,	1491:8, 1493:1,	1510:17, 1510:20,	1461:3, 1462:21,	1439:7, 1439:12,
1479:16, 1479:17,	1495:23	1511:2, 1511:5,	1462:22, 1466:4,	1464:20, 1509:1,
1479:19, 1479:25,	Total [2] - 1484:11,	1511:7, 1511:17,	1466:7, 1470:2,	1509:24
1480:2, 1480:3,	1520:8	1511:19, 1512:14,	1472:11, 1472:13,	ultimate [1] -
1483:14, 1483:20,	total [41] - 1452:5,	1512:17, 1512:20,	1473:5, 1475:1,	1447:15
1491:17, 1491:19,	1457:24, 1458:3,	1512:22, 1513:5,	1475:20, 1479:22,	ultimately [1] -
1491:20, 1492:22,	1458:4, 1459:11,	1514:4, 1514:5,	1480:13, 1481:10,	1441:14
1492:25, 1494:6,	1459:14, 1459:11,	1514:15, 1514:19,	1481:12, 1483:3,	unable [1] - 1455:23
1494:7, 1494:11,		1514:21, 1514:25,	1483:6, 1485:9,	unadjusted [1] -
1494:12, 1494:25,	1469:17, 1470:9,		1487:22, 1489:7,	1490:24
1495:3, 1495:18,	1470:14, 1470:16,	1516:25, 1517:2, 1517:3, 1517:8	1489:8, 1489:14,	unallotted [4] -
1495:21, 1496:6,	1470:19, 1481:11,	1517:3, 1517:8,	1489:20, 1491:3,	1449:22, 1449:23,
1496:14, 1496:21,	1482:13, 1482:15,	1517:16, 1517:18,	1492:1, 1494:4,	1449:25, 1450:5
1497:3, 1497:5,	1482:16, 1483:6,	1519:8, 1519:9		unavailability [1] -
1497:10, 1502:16,	1483:8, 1484:9,	treat [1] - 1453:18	1496:12, 1496:13, 1498:24, 1500:12	1442:20
1502:21, 1503:10,	1484:18, 1484:19,	treated [4] - 1453:17,	1498:24, 1500:12,	unavailable [1] -
	1486:25, 1488:16,	1453:19, 1453:20,	1501:21, 1502:6,	1445:23
1503:12, 1503:17,	1491:1, 1491:8,	1468:13	1503:14, 1503:15,	
1503:19, 1503:21,	1491:9, 1491:25,	treating [1] - 1504:7	1503:17, 1503:24,	unaware [1] -
1503:23, 1504:1,	1493:17, 1498:2,	Trial [1] - 1439:6	1505:9, 1505:12,	1453:24
1504:4, 1504:14,	1504:20, 1505:2,	trial [2] - 1451:5,	1505:21, 1507:22,	uncashed [1] -
1504:19, 1504:24,	1505:12, 1508:18,	1455:15	1508:1, 1508:5,	1496:7
1505:13, 1505:15,	1508:19, 1511:21,	Tribal [12] - 1465:5,	1508:16, 1510:25,	under [13] - 1470:12,
1505:22, 1506:2,	1513:16, 1516:19,	1466:4, 1466:6,	1511:15, 1513:2,	1470:20, 1484:6,
1507:12, 1507:18,	1516:20, 1520:1,	1471:25, 1472:4,	1513:19, 1515:1,	1493:12, 1493:19,
1509:17, 1521:15,	1520:4, 1521:4	1472:5, 1472:15,	1515:12, 1516:1,	1493:23, 1493:24,
1521:17, 1521:18,	totaling [1] - 1470:4	1472:18, 1472:20,	1520:14	1500:25, 1519:3,
1				

i	1	1	1	i
1520:6, 1520:7,	1486:14, 1487:4,	week [1] - 1461:20	1454:11, 1461:4,	yourself [2] - 1460:3,
1520:8, 1520:9	1488:15, 1488:16,	weekend [2] -	1476:6, 1476:16,	1496:16
Under [1] - 1518:11	1488:18, 1510:25,	1441:7, 1441:19	1478:10, 1479:8,	
underlying [1] -	1513:2, 1513:16	weeks [1] - 1471:20	1483:9, 1484:10,	z
1455:24	values [2] - 1447:21,	weighted [1] -	1488:3, 1488:9,	
understandable [1] -	1450:3	1482:15	1491:7, 1493:4,	zero [2] - 1449:2,
1483:15	variation [2] -	West [1] - 1438:24	1493:9, 1493:18,	1461:13
understate [1] -	1495:10	whatsoever [1] -	1494:8, 1495:9,	
1451:4	varies [1] - 1483:10	1489:4	1495:10, 1497:20,	
understated [3] -	variety [1] - 1443:6	whereas [1] -	1498:6, 1499:3,	
1450:16, 1451:6,	verify [1] - 1474:7	1485:17	1501:9, 1503:4,	
1451:24	version [1] - 1487:18	whole [1] - 1456:15	1504:10, 1504:19,	
undoubtedly [1] -	versus [7] - 1441:3,	WILLIAM [1] -	1505:11, 1506:7,	
1461:20	1454:15, 1482:16,	1438:15	1509:2, 1509:6,	
uninvested [3] -	1485:23, 1488:25,	Williams [1] - 1473:8	1509:9, 1509:10,	
1506:16, 1506:24,	1493:5, 1506:24	Winston [1] -	1510:18, 1511:4,	
1508:3	vested [1] - 1465:9	1438:25	1511:7, 1511:12,	
UNITED [2] - 1438:1,	view [1] - 1479:14	Winston-Salem [1] -	1513:17, 1514:1,	
1438:9	viewed [1] - 1453:25	1438:25	1515:8, 1515:12,	
United [12] -	vis [2] - 1467:11	wise [1] - 1488:22	1515:15, 1515:18,	
1460:14, 1462:15,	vis-a-vis [1] -	wish [1] - 1467:13	1516:5, 1517:8,	
1464:24, 1465:1,	1467:11	withheld [2] -	1518:14, 1518:15,	
1465:11, 1465:24,		1497:7, 1497:8	1518:16, 1518:20,	
1467:7, 1477:17,	W	witness [1] - 1458:9	1519:1, 1519:6,	
1477:19, 1478:17,	•••	WITNESS [1] - 1450.5	1519:9, 1519:11,	
1478:19, 1506:7	wait [1] - 1480:3	1440:2, 1444:5,	1519:13, 1519:19,	
units [1] - 1508:21	walked [1] - 1457:17	1479:16, 1479:19,	1519:23, 1520:4	
University [2] -	wants [1] - 1441:24	1480:2, 1491:19,	Year [1] - 1520:9	
1443:2, 1443:9	war [17] - 1500:7,	1494:7, 1494:12,	year's [2] - 1518:14,	
unless [1] - 1465:25	1500:9, 1501:14,	1495:3, 1495:21,	1518:21	
unpaid [1] - 1482:12	1502:18, 1503:11,	1502:21, 1503:12,	year-by-year [1] -	
unrelated [1] -	1503:16, 1503:18,	1503:19, 1503:23,	1493:4	
1442:21	1503:19, 1503:21,	1504:4, 1504:19,	year-to-year [2] -	
unusual [1] -	1503:25, 1504:2,	1521:17	1495:9, 1495:10	
1453:16	1504:5, 1504:6,	witness' [1] -	years [44] - 1443:3,	
up [23] - 1444:11,	1504:10, 1504:17,	1507:14	1454:1, 1454:3,	
1450:18, 1451:25,	1505:1, 1508:9	witnesses [2] -	1454:10, 1455:6,	
1452:8, 1456:18,	War [2] - 1502:18,	1445:1, 1468:10	1455:9, 1455:17,	
1456:20, 1461:12,	1502:21	words [2] - 1479:11,	1455:20, 1456:11,	
1461:13, 1465:22,	Warshawsky [4] -	1479:13	1457:21, 1464:6,	
1469:2, 1470:6,	1440:4, 1441:4,	works [2] - 1454:23,	1464:16, 1469:15,	
1479:13, 1483:2,	1442:9, 1507:16	1509:22	1472:22, 1478:18,	
1484:23, 1495:7,	WARSHAWSKY [10]	World [2] - 1502:18,	1481:14, 1481:15,	
1497:15, 1498:13,	- 1439:1, 1441:5,	1502:21	1481:17, 1481:22,	
1499:9, 1505:24,	1441:9, 1442:5,	write [1] - 1496:16	1481:23, 1481:25,	
1507:13, 1507:14,	1443:22, 1473:24,	writing [1] - 1464:25	1482:3, 1482:17,	
1512:2, 1519:16	1478:5, 1507:5,	written [12] -	1483:13, 1488:1,	
upward [1] - 1450:17	1507:10, 1509:13	1445:13, 1481:9,	1491:11, 1494:9,	
uses [1] - 1517:13	wash [1] - 1511:22	1482:11, 1482:16,	1494:13, 1494:19,	
utilize [3] - 1485:20,	washed [1] - 1511:1	1482:20, 1485:23,	1495:4, 1495:11,	
1485:22, 1486:6	Washington [7] -	1488:19, 1488:23,	1500:14, 1502:1,	
utilized [2] - 1458:5,	1438:4, 1438:13,	1488:24, 1491:2,	1502:18, 1502:21,	
1475:7	1438:21, 1439:4,	1491:12	1502:22, 1502:23,	
	1439:9, 1439:13,	wrongful [1] - 1497:9	1508:16, 1513:10,	
V	1499:4	wrongfully [1] -	1513:15, 1515:17, 1516:8	
	wasted [1] - 1505:15	1497:7	1516:8	
value [15] - 1459:11,	ways [3] - 1448:2,		yesterday [1] - 1441:20	
1459:14, 1459:17,	1448:19, 1457:18	Y		
1469:17, 1484:17,	weaknesses [1] -		you [1] - 1514:7	
1484:18, 1484:20,	1479:6	year [60] - 1453:17,	Young [1] - 1443:2	